This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`



GANSEVOORT-LANSING
COLLECTION
given to the New York Public Library
Astor Lenox and Tilden Foundations
BY VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS
under the terms of the last will and testament of
CATHERINE GANSEVOORT LANSING
granddaughter of
General Peter Gansevoort, junior
and widow of the
Honorable Abraham Lansing
of Albany, New York

YBX
Baccu

THE WORKS

OF

FRANCIS BACON.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

THE

WORKS

OF

FRANCIS BACON,

BARON OF VERULAM, VISCOUNT ST. ALBANS, AND
LORD HIGH CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND.

Collected and Edited

BY

JAMES SPEDDING, M.A.
OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE;

ROBERT LESLIE ELLIS, M.A.
LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE;

AND

DOUGLAS DENON HEATH,
BARRISTER-AT-LAW; LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

VOLUME XI.

BEING

VOL. I. OF THE LITERARY AND PROFESSIONAL WORKS.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY BROWN AND TAGGARD.
MDCCCLX.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
15707A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1921 L

RIVERSIDE, CAMBRIDGE:
STEREOTYPED AND PRINTED BY
H. O. HOUGHTON.

PREFACE.

Among the Harleian manuscripts in the British Museum, there is a volume bearing the following title: — "The Writings of Sir Francis Bacon, Knt., the King's Solicitor General, in Morality, Policy, and History." It is only half filled, and contains nothing but essays. We may infer however from the title-page that it was at that time Bacon's intention to gather his writings of that class into a separate collection; and I suppose that if it had been continued and completed according to that intention, it would have contained all such pieces as are here collected under the title of Literary Works; by which I mean works which were intended to take their place among *books;* as distinguished from writings of business, which though they may be collected into books afterwards, were composed without reference to anything beyond the particular occasion to which they relate. The Philosophical Works contained in the first three volumes of this edition belong of course to this class; and next to them in order of importance come the

Historical, Moral, and Political Works, of which this volume contains the most considerable.

For the particular history of each piece, and the manner in which I have dealt with it, I refer to the several prefaces. Those which are written in Latin, are followed by English translations; for which, as indeed for everything in this volume, I am alone and entirely responsible.

The engraving which stands as frontispiece is a very correct representation of a bust belonging to the Earl of Verulam, to whose kindness I am indebted for permission to have a drawing made of it for this purpose, as well as for the facilities given to the artist. It is a colored bust in terra-cotta, and is one of a set of three, done in the same style and material, and apparently by the same hand; said to be portraits of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Anne, his second wife, and their son Francis, when twelve years old. I regret that I could not learn anything more about them. They must have been done about the year 1572, by an artist of no ordinary skill, and have probably been at Gorhambury ever since. They show, among other things, that Bacon's likeness was to his mother; a fact, I believe, not otherwise known.

J. S.

CONTENTS

OF

THE ELEVENTH VOLUME.

LITERARY WORKS.

History of the Reign of King Henry VII. . . . 11

Appendix I.—Great Councils 367

II.—Perkin Warbeck's Proclamation . . 374

III.—Character of Henry VII. from the Latin Translation 379

The Beginning of the History of the Reign of King Henry VIII. 391

The Beginning of the History of Great Britain 399

In Felicem Memoriam Elizabethæ, Angliæ Reginæ 411

The same translated into English 443

THE

LITERARY AND PROFESSIONAL WORKS

OF

FRANCIS BACON.

LITERARY WORKS.

PREFACE

TO THE

HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF HENRY VII.

THE history of the reign of King Henry the Seventh was the first work composed by Bacon after his fall; the fruit of his first few months of leisure. The subject indeed of which it forms the opening chapter — viz: a History of England from the Union of the Roses to the Union of the Crowns — was one which he had long before pointed out as eminently worth handling; but until the time when he saw his retirement from public life inevitable, and that (to use his own words) "being no longer able to do his country service it remained to him to do it honour," he does not seem to have thought of undertaking any part of it himself. And though it may appear from a letter to the king that he had conceived the purpose as early as the 21st of April 1621, when he was in the middle of his troubles, it is not before the 4th of June, when he was released from the Tower, — hardly perhaps before the 22nd, when he returned to Gorhambury, — that he can be supposed to have commenced the work. By the end of the following October, or thereabouts, he had

finished this portion of it in its present form, and sent a fair transcript to the king. It may be regarded therefore as the labour of a long vacation.

To say that such a work was executed in four or five months by a man who was excluded (except during the last six weeks) from London, where all the unpublished materials were, is to say that it is in many ways imperfect. The original records of the time had not been studied by any man with a genius for writing history, nor gathered into a book by any laborious collector. The published histories were full of inaccuracies and omissions, which it was impossible to correct or supply without much laborious research in public archives and private collections. The various studies of his civil life had made him acquainted no doubt with many things illustrative of his subject; but for these he must have trusted to the fidelity of his memory. What Sir Robert Cotton could supply was liberally communicated; but Cotton House was within the forbidden precinct, and any man who has attempted this kind of work knows how imperfect a substitute another man's eyes and judgment are for his own. For the rest of his raw material he must have trusted entirely to the published histories then extant; to Fabyan, who furnished only a naked and imperfect chronicle of London news; to Polydore Vergil, who supplied a narrative, continuous indeed and aspiring to be historical, but superficial and careless and full of errors; to Hall and Holinshed, who did little more than translate and embellish Polydore; to Stowe, whose independent and original researches had only contributed a few additional facts and dates; and to Speed, whose history, though enriched with some valuable records

and digested with a more discriminating judgment than had been brought to the task before, was yet composed for the most part out of the old materials, and retained almost all the errors.

From these imperfect, unskilful, and inaccurate outlines, aided by the fruits of his own former reading and observation, by a learned acquaintance with the statutes of the realm, and by such original documents as Sir Robert Cotton could supply, to educe a living likeness of the man and the time, to detect the true relations of events, and to present them to the reader in their proper succession and proportions, was the task which he now undertook.

In this, which under such conditions was all he could attempt, he succeeded so well that he has left later historians little to do. Subsequent researches have but confirmed and illustrated the substantial truth of his history in all its main features. The portrait of Henry as drawn by him is the original, more or less faithfully copied, of all the portraits which have been drawn since. The theory of the events of Henry's reign as formed and expounded by him has been adopted by every succeeding historian as the basis of his narrative. Those who have most slighted his authority have not the less followed his guidance and drawn their light from him. Those who have aspired to correct his work have only turned a likeness into a caricature and history into invective. The composition bears indeed some traces of the haste with which it was written: but if that be the best history which conveys to a reader the clearest conception of the state and progress of affairs during the period of which it treats, not one of the histories of Henry the Seventh that have been

written since can bear a comparison with this. The facts he was obliged, for the reasons above stated, to take and leave almost as he found them; but the effect of his treatment of them was like that of bringing a light into a dark room: the objects are there as they were before, but now you can distinguish them.

In superintending a new edition of this history I have aimed chiefly at four things. 1st, to obtain a correct text. 2nd, to ascertain as far as possible whether the statements in the text are accurate; and to point out in foot-notes all inaccuracies, however trivial. 3rd, to supply omissions, where they seemed important. And lastly, to notice all passages in which the Latin translation (which was prepared under Bacon's own eye some years after) varies in meaning from the original English.

1. For the text, there are only two authorities of any value: the original manuscript, which was submitted to the king in the autumn of 1621, and is preserved (all but a few leaves) in the British Museum; and the original edition, which was printed in the following March. Which of these two is the best authority, it is not easy to decide. The print, as being the later, may be supposed to have the last corrections. But the manuscript, as having certainly been looked over and corrected by Bacon himself (which it is not certain that the proof-sheets were), may be supposed to have the fewest errors. I do not know how far it was usual in those days for the author to meddle with his work after it was in the printer's hands; but in this case, from a careful comparison of the two, I am inclined to think that where the print varies from the manuscript, it is generally by mistake. It is from the

manuscript therefore that I have printed the text. The various readings of the printed copy I have quoted in the notes: neglecting however all varieties of mere form, such as the introduction of capital letters, of italics, and of inverted commas; which, as there is no direction for them in the manuscript, I ascribe to the printer's fancy and the typographical fashion of the day. In the division of the paragraphs I have also silently followed the manuscript; without noticing the places where the printed copy gives a different one, unless there be a doubt which is right. The spelling is modernised throughout: and I have used my own judgment as to the punctuation;—observing always the spirit and intention of the punctuation in the manuscript.

This manuscript may be seen in the British Museum; Additional MSS. vol. 7084. It is a fair transcript in a very clear hand. Bacon's own pen may be recognised here and there throughout, sometimes in the alteration of a stop, sometimes in the insertion of a parenthesis, sometimes in the correction of a letter, sometimes in the interlineation of two or three words. A few leaves are wanting, which are noticed in the places.

The printed copy is a tall quarto of 248 pages, with the following title, *The Historie of the Raigne of King Henry the Seventh, written by the Right Honourable Francis Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Alban. London. Printed by W. Stansby for Matthew Lownes and William Barret*, 1622. A portrait of Henry, with sceptre and ball, is prefixed; harshly engraved by John Payne; with the inscription *cor regis inscrutabile.* The face,—thoughtful, anxious, lean, and furrowed,—seems to be

the original of the comely, grave, well-fed gentleman with whom we are familiar in Vertue's engraving. The book was printed and ready for publication on the 20th of March 1621–2; and "the printer's fingers itched to be selling."[1] Some delay seems to have been caused by a scruple of the Bishop of London; but it was published soon after.[2]

2. In order to detect inaccuracies, I have endeavoured (besides consulting the more recent histories) to determine, wherever I could do so from authentic sources, the exact dates of the transactions related; and where I have found them inconsistent with the narrative, or have otherwise detected or seen reason to suspect any error, I have noticed the fact; not confining myself to cases in which the error seems to be of consequence; but correcting positive misstatements of every kind; for it is impossible to say of any fact that it is of no consequence, unless you could know how it may be combined with other facts and what inferences it may be made to support.

3. With regard to the supply of *omissions*, on the contrary, I have taken pains to distinguish the important from the unimportant. Clearness of narrative depends upon nothing more than upon the rejection of what is immaterial; and innumerable particulars were no doubt omitted by Bacon on purpose. Nevertheless many facts have come to light since Bacon's time which he would have introduced into his narrative if he had been aware of them; and whatever has seemed

[1] See a letter from Meautys, which appears to have been written on that day.

[2] It was out on the 6th of April. See a letter from Rev. Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville. — *Court and Times of James I.*, vol. ii. p. 303.

to me to be of this nature, I have not hesitated to introduce in the notes. So that I hope this history may now be recommended not only as the richest, clearest, and liveliest narrative, and in general effect the most faithful portraiture, of the time (which with all its defects it always was); but also as the most complete in details and the most accurate in information.

4. Lastly, with regard to the Latin translation. This edition being intended especially for English readers, it has not been thought desirable to increase its size and cost by reprinting translations which were intended only for foreigners; and which, being for the most part *mere* translations, no English reader would prefer to the original. It was to be remembered however that they were made either by Bacon himself or under his eye and direction ("Historiam Henrici Septimi, *quam etiam in Latinum verti*," is his own expression in the dedication prefixed to the *Sermones Fideles*); and therefore that where they differ in meaning or effect more than the different idiom of the language seems to require, the Latin must pass for the later and better authority. I have therefore compared the two sentence by sentence, and wherever I have found that the Latin version contains any meaning that is not fully or exactly represented by the English,—that it explains an obscure, decides a doubtful, or corrects an inaccurate expression,—I have quoted the Latin words.

This I think is all I need say in explanation of my own part in the revision and elucidation of this work. A few words as to the character of the work itself. For it will be seen that, while admitting and account-

ing for its imperfections, I have ascribed to it a substantial excellence far higher than it has credit for; and I may be expected to give a reason for dissenting from the popular judgment, supported as it is by some eminent authorities.

In so far as the difference is a matter of taste, I can only say that since the proper object of history is to reproduce such an image of the past that the actors shall seem to live and the events to pass before our eyes, that style of historical composition should be the best in which this is most completely accomplished; and that I have met with no history of the reign of Henry the Seventh, nor indeed of any other English king, in which such an effect is produced in a degree at all comparable to this. Indeed if the question could be made to turn upon that point, I almost think that such would be the general opinion. But it is true that during the last century popular taste in this kind of composition ran another way; forsaking the model of Thucydides, in whose pages the events of the Peloponnesian war still live as fresh as those which we follow day by day in the newspapers; and declining to that of the Annual Register, where the events of 1848, so strange, so interesting, so agitating, as we read of them while they were passing, may be seen laid up in 1849 as dead and dry as mummies. In so far as it is a question of taste, Bacon's history, tried by such a standard, must of course fail.

It is not however to a difference of taste merely, that the low place which it holds in popular estimation must be attributed. It is connected no doubt with a very prevalent, though a very erroneous, impression, that it is *not* a true portraiture of the time; that it was written

with other objects than those of a faithful historian; written not to reproduce a true image of Henry the Seventh, but to flatter the humour of James the First by drawing such a picture of his ancestor as should indirectly reflect honour on himself. I do not know into whose imagination this idea first entered, but it lies at the bottom of most modern criticisms, and is set forth at large by Sir James Mackintosh in a note appended to the second volume of his History of England, in Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia. The question being too serious to be passed over, and the authority too respectable to be overruled without showing reasons, I shall quote his note at length.

"Lord Bacon was the man of highest intellect among the writers of history; but he was not the greatest historian. History ought to be without passion; but if it be without feeling, it loses the interest which bestows on it the power of being useful. The narrative of human actions would be thrown aside as a mere catalogue of names and dates, if it did not maintain its sway by inspiring the reader with pity for the sufferer, with anger against the oppressor, and with earnest desires for the triumph of right over might. The defects of Bacon's nature conspired with the faults of his conception of history to taint his work with lukewarm censure of falsehood and extortion, with a cool display of the expedients of cunning, and with too systematic a representation of the policy of a monarch in whose history he chose to convey a theory of kingcraft and the likeness of its ideal model. A writer who has been successful in unravelling an intricate character often becomes indulgent to the man whose seeming inconsistencies he has explained, and may at length regard the workings of his own ingenuity with a complacency which prevails over his indignation. Aristotle, who first attempted a theory of usurpation, has escaped the appearance of this fault, partly because sensibility is not expected, and would displease in a treatise on government. Machiavel was unhappily too successful in silencing his abhorrence of crimes; but this fault is chiefly to be found in "The Prince," which is a treatise on the art of winning and keeping tyrannical

power; which was destined by the writer neither to instruct tyrants nor to warn nations against their arts, but simply to add the theory of these arts to the stock of human knowledge; as a philosophical treatise on poisons might be intended only to explain their nature and effects, though the information contained in it might be abused by the dealer in poison, or usefully employed for cure or relief by the physician.

"Lord Bacon displayed a much smaller degree of this vice, but he displayed it in history, where it is far more unpardonable. In the singular passage where he lays down the theory of the advancement of fortune (which he knew so well and practised so ill), he states the maxim which induced the Grecian and Italian philosophers to compose their dissertations, 'that there be not anything in being or action which should not be drawn into contemplation or doctrine.' He almost avows an intention of embodying in the person of his hero (if that be the proper term) too much of the ideal conception of a wary, watchful, unbending ruler, who considers men and affairs merely as they affect him and his kingdom; who has no good quality higher then prudence; who is taught by policy not to be cruel when he is secure, but who treats pity and affection like malice and hatred, as passions which disturb his thoughts and bias his judgment. So systematic a purpose cannot fail to distort character and events, and to divest both of their power over feeling. It would have been impossible for Lord Bacon, if he had not been betrayed by his chilling scheme, to prefer Louis XI. to Louis XII., and to declare that Louis XI., Ferdinand the Catholic, and Henry VII., were the '*three magi among the kings of the age;*' though it be true that Henry was the least odious of the three royal sages.

"It is due in the strictest justice to Lord Bacon not to omit, that the history was written to gratify James I., to whom he was then suing for bitter bread, who revised it, and whom he addressed in the following words: — 'I have therefore chosen to write the reign of Henry VII., who was in a sort your forerunner; and whose spirit as well as his blood is doubled upon your majesty.' Bacon had just been delivered from prison: he had passed his sixtieth year, and was galled by unhonoured poverty. What wonder if in these circumstances even his genius sunk under such a patron and such a theme!"[1]

[1] Lardner's Cyclopædia, Hist. of England, vol. ii. p. 362.

Now setting aside for the present the general question as to the spirit in which history *ought* to be written, and the particular question as to the spirit in which this history *is* written, upon both which points I shall have a word to say presently, let us first consider the more positive and definite imputations contained in the foregoing passage. That Bacon wrote the book to gratify James; that in order to gratify James he represented Henry as a model of king-craft; and that the systematic purpose of so representing Henry as a model of king-craft "distorted character and events;" — this is what the charge amounts to. And it is important to know how far it is true. For if it were so, to set about detecting and rectifying historical inaccuracies would be a mere waste of time and a mistaking of the proper duty of an editor. In that case the book as a history would be merely worthless. It would be curious only as a record of Bacon's idea — or rather of what he supposed to be James's idea — of a model king, and should be treated accordingly.

It seems to me however that the hypothesis is not only uncalled for, but utterly untenable.

That he "wrote the book to gratify James I." is indeed in one sense true enough. He wanted to do some service which James would appreciate, and he knew that a good history of so important a reign was one of the best services he could perform, and one the most certain to be appreciated. But it is plain that Sir J. Mackintosh meant something more than this; and if he meant, as I presume he did, that Bacon *chose the subject* because it gave him an opportunity for *flattering* James, — I would first ask, why anybody should think so? Is it not the very same subject

which at least fifteen years before he had wished *some one else* to undertake for the simple purpose of supplying a main defect in our national literature?[1] Did not the defect still remain? And was he not now at leisure to undertake the subject himself? Why then seek any further for his motive in choosing it?

But suppose he did choose the subject for the purpose of flattering James, how did he propose to treat it, so as to produce that effect? By setting up Henry the Seventh (we are told) as the model of a king! Now Henry was in his entire character and in all his ways, both as a man and as a king, the very contrast and opposite to James himself. Both indeed professed to love peace; and both were constant, without being uxorious, to their wives. But there the resemblance ends. In all other respects, to set up either as the model of what a king should be is little less than to point out the other as the model of what a king should not be. Neither was this a difficulty inherent in the subject. For however obvious and ineffaceable those features of Henry's character may appear *to us*, which mark him as so peculiarly the opposite of James, we are to remember that we read it by the light which Bacon himself threw upon it; that it was Bacon himself who brought them to light, — brought them to light in this very history for the first time. Henry's character as drawn by preceding historians might have been used for purposes of flattery well enough. "He was a Prince," says Stowe, reporting the substance,

[1] See his "Letter to the Lord Chancellor touching a History of Britain;" the original of which, preserved at Bridgwater House, is dated 2 April, 1605. — Collier's Descriptive Catalogue, p. 17. See also *Advancement of Learning*, the Second Book, paragraph 5.

without the flourishes, of what he found in Hall and Polydore, "of marvellous wisdom, policy, justice, temperance, and gravity, and notwithstanding many and great occasions of trouble and war he kept his realm in right good order, for the which he was greatly reverenced of foreign princes." Such a passage would have been a very fair foundation in fact for a fancy-portrait of a great and wise king. A man combining in himself all the cardinal virtues and reigning in a continued succession of victorious achievements in peace and war (so history reported him) might easily by a less skilful hand than Bacon's, using a very little of the novelist's or rhetorician's licence, have been turned into a handsome likeness of James — or of anybody else. And who can believe that if Bacon had been really studying, not to draw the man as he was, but to produce such a representation of him as should seem to reflect honour upon his descendant, he would have introduced into the portrait those traits of coldness, reserve, suspicion, avarice, parsimony, party-spirit, partiality in the administration of justice when he was himself interested, finesse which was not policy, strength of will which blinded judgment, closeness and darkness which bred danger; — traits which are *now* inextricably interwoven with our idea of the man; but for traces of which the pages of Fabyan, of Polydore Vergil, of Hall, of Holinshed, and of Stowe, will be searched in vain? If it were necessary to believe that in introducing such features into the portrait he was thinking to gratify James at all, we must suppose that it was not by *raising* Henry to an ideal eminence which did not belong to him, but by *degrading* him from that ideal eminence which he enjoyed; and there-

by relieving the reigning Solomon from his great rival for that title. But the thing seems to me altogether incredible.

If it be urged on the other hand that the character of Henry as interpreted by Bacon, however unlike it may be to James, is not so unlike Bacon himself; and that he was therein delineating his own ideal; it is enough to say that many of the peculiarities which he detects and points out in Henry's mind and ways, are noticed as weaknesses and errors, derogatory to his judgment and injurious to his fortunes. Many of his difficulties, for instance, are attributed to the shortness of his foresight, which prevented him from seeing distant dangers in time to prevent them. Who can suppose that that entered into Bacon's idea of a politic king? His "settled determination to depress all eminent persons of the house of York," might perhaps, upon Machiavel's principle that in order to secure a conquest it is necessary to extirpate the reigning family, have been reconciled with the proposed ideal. But Bacon expressly notices it as an error in his policy arising from a weakness in his mind; and the cause in fact of almost all his troubles. The severity of his exactions again is excused by Polydore Vergil as a politic art to keep turbulent subjects in obedience. Bacon imputes it to a vice of his nature in coveting to accumulate treasure, and represents it as procuring him the hatred of his people to such a degree that his state was insecure even in the height of his felicity. In the matter of Brittany, Bacon represents him as outwitted by the French king: and how? not (as Polydore would have it) from reposing too much trust in the promises of his confederates; but simply because the

French king understood the case, and he did not. His system of secret espionage is indeed justified, as necessary to protect him against secret machinations; but the darkness and closeness with which he conducted all his affairs is censured, as creating general diffidence and alarm which bred danger. His discountenancing of the nobility, which has been regarded by some historians as a stroke of profound policy to which the subsequent settlement of the kingdom was chiefly owing, is considered by Bacon "as one of the causes of his troublesome reign." And generally the many difficulties with which he had to contend are expressly mentioned as not inherent in the case, but as the consequence of "some grand defects and main errors in his nature, customs, or proceedings." Nay, the sum total of his achievements is evidently regarded by Bacon as hardly worthy of him; and the short-coming is ascribed not to any want of opportunity or untowardness of fortune, but to a deficiency in himself, — a deficiency fatal to all heroic pretensions, — a want of worthier aims. "If the king (he says) did no greater matters, it was long of himself; for what he minded he compassed." Who can suppose that in such a representation he meant "to convey a theory of king-craft and the likeness of its ideal model"?

But we are told that he almost owns as much himself — "almost avows an intention of embodying in the person of his hero too much of the ideal conception" &c. &c. Where such an avowal is to be found we are not informed; and I cannot myself discover any passage in which he speaks of what he intends to do. When he speaks of what he *has* done, he certainly makes an avowal of a very different kind. "I have

not flattered him" (he says in his dedicatory letter), "but took him to the life, as well as I could, sitting so far off and having no better light." And certainly this is the short and true account of the whole matter. Whoever will take the trouble to compare this history with those that went before, will be convinced that the portrait of Henry is a true study from nature, and one of the most careful, curious, and ingenious studies of the kind ever produced. It is important too that this should be understood; because upon this it is that the main interest of the work depends. For it must be confessed that Henry's reign, though entertaining from the bustle and variety of incidents, and important for some of its results, includes but few matters which for themselves are much worth remembering. The subjects of all those negotiations and treaties retain no interest for us. The wars and the warriors have alike passed and left no trace. The story of Perkin Warbeck has the interest only of a great romance. The laws did indeed print their footsteps deeper; but the progress of knowledge and the changes of time have gone over them too, and they remain only as curiosities of the past. But as the memory runs back along the surface of English history from the last of the Georges to the first of the Plantagenets, the reign of Henry the Seventh still presents one conspicuous object;—an example of a king who was also prime minister; a king, not indeed of ideal wisdom or virtue, but yet of rare sagacity, industry, and courage, who for twenty-three years really governed the country by his own wit and his own will. Bacon has accordingly treated the history of his reign as a history of the administration of affairs in England from 1485 to

1509, and represented Henry as what he really was during all that time, the sole and real minister, conducting in person the affairs of each several department.

In what *spirit* he has executed the work, what kind of moral impression the narrative is made to suggest, is a question difficult to answer, because different readers will be differently affected by it. I would only say that those readers who, like Sir James Mackintosh, rise from the perusal of the narrative full of passionate pity for the oppressed, and resentment against the oppressor so vehement that it overflows even upon the innocent historian whose faithful report has excited it, are the last persons who ought to complain of the writer for telling his story in such a way as *not* to produce such impressions. If strong disapprobation and dislike of Henry be the feeling which his history properly written ought to excite, there is scarcely a writer that has touched the subject since who may not be called as an unconscious witness that Bacon's history has in that respect done its office. We do not blame a painter for flattery because he does not write under his picture "this is the portrait of an ugly man;" enough if he paints him as he sees him. Why blame a historian because, content with describing his hero as he is, he abstains from calling him names?

Passing from the particular to the general question, there is no doubt a real and considerable difference between Bacon's conception of the proper office of history and Mackintosh's. According to Bacon, "it is the true office of history to represent the events themselves, together with the counsels; and to leave the observations and conclusions thereupon to the liberty

and faculty of every man's judgment."[1] According to Mackintosh, history so written "loses the interest which bestows on it the power of being useful:" it must "maintain its sway" by inspiring feelings of pity, anger, &c.

Now that the reader, in order to derive any benefit from history, must *feel* as he reads, Bacon I suppose would not have denied; but he would have said that the reader should be able to feel without being told when and how; that when an object of emotion is truly represented to a capable mind, the emotion will follow of itself; that a man who is affected by the sight of good and bad in nature, will be affected in the same way when he sees them in a book; that if he be not, it is for want not of epithets and exclamations and notes of admiration in the history, but of moral sensibility in himself, and he should be referred to the preacher or moralist for his cure before he comes to the secular historian. The duty of the historian, being first of all to set forth the truth of the case upon which judgment is to pass, bears a very close analogy to the duty of the judge in summing up. The summing up of the judge is truly the history of the case; it is meant not only to inform the jury as to the facts, but also to guide their judgment. Now we see that in performing this part of his duty the judge is expected carefully to abstain from all expressions which address themselves to the feelings of the jury as distinguished from their judgment; which are calculated "to inspire pity for the sufferer, anger against the oppressor, or earnest desires for the triumph of right over might." The common sense of Englishmen (guided in this case

[1] Adv. of Learn. the Second Book, paragraph 7.

more perhaps than in any other by real earnestness and sincerity) has established this as a rule; the clear purposes of justice manifestly requiring that such feelings should not be allowed to mix with the consideration of the case, but be left to follow the judgment; as (if the case be truly judged) they inevitably will. And the historian would do well to remember, whatever his personal feelings may be, that his is the part, not of the counsel on either side, but (as I said) of the judge when he is expounding the case to the jury so that they may be best able to come to a just opinion on it.

Or if this example be objected to as not strictly parallel, (because the purposes of justice are satisfied if the jury come to a correct opinion as to the fact, whereas the purposes of history require that a correct opinion as to the fact should be followed by just feelings as to the right and the wrong,) and if an example be called for of some real history maintaining its proper sway over the reader's feelings without the aid of epithets, exclamations, or comments to direct and stimulate his sensibility; it is enough to say that in that book which all who profess and call themselves Christians are bound to acknowledge as the highest authority, the most odious of all treasons, the most unjust of all judgments, the most pathetic of all tales of martyred innocence, is related four times over without a single indignant comment or a single vituperative expression.

I have dwelt on these points longer perhaps than I need have done in so plain a case. But the error of supposing that Bacon's history was written to flatter Henry has done much mischief. Almost all our mod-

ern historians, in trying to correct the supposed flattery, have in fact spoiled the likeness, and so in effect blotted out of that chapter of our history the very thing which was most memorable in it.

In speaking of the character of Henry as described by the writers who preceded Bacon, it will be seen that I have quoted Stowe, and said nothing of Speed, whose history was published in 1609, some years after Stowe's death. But the truth is, that though Bacon's history of Henry's reign was not written till 1621, he had drawn up a slight sketch of Henry's character many years before, of which Speed had a copy, and knew the value and made the right use. He quotes it at the outset of his history of this reign; "being fit," as he says, "to be set in front to his actions, as certain lights of the mind by which to discern the fountain of counsels and causes." As far therefore as the character of Henry is concerned, and so much of the interpretation of his actions as depends upon a true insight into his character, Speed is not to be reckoned among the historians who preceded Bacon.

The sketch I speak of concludes a short historical fragment, entitled, *The History of the reigns of K. Henry the VIII, K. Edward, Q. Mary, and part of Q. Elizabeth*, of which there is a fair MS. in the Harleian collection (532. fo. 45.) The name of the writer is not given; but, even without Speed's authority, who quotes it as "fragm. MS. of Sr. Fr. B." there would be no doubt whatever that it is Bacon's. It was afterwards printed, very inaccurately, in the Cabala, Ed. 1663, p. 254., but without any suspicion as to the author; and it is rather singular

that, being extant in so common a book, it has never been claimed or noticed by any of Bacon's numerous editors and commentators. It contains indeed little that may not be found elsewhere in his works, yet like all his other fragments and rudiments it is well worth preserving; and there is no fitter place for it than at the end of this preface. It was written, it will be seen, while Elizabeth was still reigning; and his intention then was to begin with the accession of Henry the Eighth, or rather perhaps with a sketch of the condition in which Henry the Seventh left the kingdom. The idea of beginning with the accession of Henry the Seventh occurred to him afterwards in 1605; as may be seen by comparing his well known letter to Lord Chancellor Egerton, which was written on the 2nd of April in that year, with the passage on the same subject in the Advancement of Learning.

The History of the reign of K. Henry the Eighth, K. Edward, Q. Mary, and part of the reign of Q. Elizabeth.

THE books which are written do in their kinds represent the faculties of the mind of man; Poesy his imagination; Philosophy his reason; and History his memory. Of which three faculties least exception is commonly taken to memory; because imagination is oftentimes idle, and reason litigious. So likewise History of all writings deserveth least taxation, as that which holdeth least of the author, and most of the things themselves. Again, the use which it holdeth to man's life, if it be not the greatest, yet assuredly is the freest from any ill accident or quality.

For those which are conversant much in poets, as they attain to great variety, so withal they become conceited; and those that are brought up in philosophy and sciences do wax (according as their nature is) some of them too stiff and opinionate, and some others too perplexed and confused. Whereas History possesseth the mind of the conceits which are nearest allied unto action, and imprinteth them so, as it doth not alter the complexion of the mind neither to irresolution nor pertinacity. But this is true, that in no sort of writings there is a greater distance between the good and the bad, no not between the most excellent poet and the vainest rhymer, nor between the deepest philosopher and the most frivolous schoolmen, than there is between good histories and those that bear the same or the like title. In which regard, having purposed to write the History of England from the beginning of the reign of K. Henry the eighth of that name near unto the present time wherein Q. Elizabeth reigneth in good felicity, I am delivered of the excuse wherewith the best writers of history are troubled in their proëms, when they go about without breaking the bounds of modesty to give a reason why they should write that again which others have written well or at least tolerably before. For those which I am to follow are such as I may rather fear the reproach of coming into their number, than the opinion of presumption if I hope to do better than they. But in the mean time it must be considered, that the best of the ancient histories were contrived out of divers particular Commentaries, Relations, and Narrations, which it was not hard to digest with ornament, and thereof to compound one entire Story.

And as at the first such writers had the ease of other's labours, so since they have the whole commendation; in regard these former writings are for the most part lost, whereby their borrowings do not appear. But unto me the disadvantage is great, finding no public memories of any consideration or worth, in sort that the supply must be out of the freshness of memory and tradition, and out of the acts, instruments, and negotiations of state themselves, together with the glances of foreign histories; which though I do acknowledge to be the best originals and instructions out of which to write an history, yet the travel must be much greater than if there had been already digested any tolerable chronicle as a simple narration of the actions themselves, which should only have needed out of the former helps to be enriched with the counsels and the speeches and notable particularities. And this was the reason why I mought not attempt to go higher to more ancient times, because those helps and grounds did more and more fail; although if I be not deceived I may truly affirm that there have no times passed over in this nation which have produced greater actions, nor more worthy to be delivered to the ages hereafter. For they be not the great wars and conquests (which many times are the works of fortune and fall out in barbarous times) the rehearsal whereof maketh the profitable and instructing history; but rather times refined in policies and industries, new and rare variety of accidents and alterations, equal and just encounters of state and state in forces and of prince and prince in sufficiency, that bring upon the stage the best parts for observation. Now if you look into the general natures of the times (which I

have undertaken) throughout Europe, whereof the times of this nation must needs participate, you shall find more knowledge in the world than was in the ages before, whereby the wits of men (which are the shops wherein all actions are forged) are more furnished and improved. Then if you shall restrain your consideration to the state of this monarchy, first there will occur unto you changes rare, and altogether unknown to antiquity, in matters of religion and the state ecclesiastical. Then to behold the several reigns, of a king that first, or next the first, became absolute in the sovereignty: of a king in minority: of a queen married to a foreigner: and lastly of a queen that hath governed without the help either of a marriage, or of any mighty man of her blood: is no small variety in the affairs of a monarchy, but such as perhaps in four successions in any state at any time is hardly to be found. Besides there have not wanted examples[1] within the compass of the same times neither of an usurpation, nor of rebellions under heads of greatness, nor of commotions merely popular, nor of sundry desperate conspiracies (an unwonted thing in hereditary monarchies), nor of foreign wars of all sorts; invasive, repulsive of invasion, open and declared, covert and underhand, by sea, by land, Scottish, French, Spanish, succors, protections, new and extraordinary kinds of confederacies with subjects. Generally without question the state of this nation never had a larger reach to import the universal affairs of Europe; as that which was in the former part of the time the counterpoise between France and Spain, and in the latter the only encounter and

[1] This word is omitted in the MS. and supplied from the Cabala.

opposition against Spain. Add hereunto the new discoveries and navigations abroad, the new provisions of laws and precedents of state at home, and the accidents memorable both of state and of court; and there will be no doubt but the times which I have chosen are of all former times of this nation [the fittest[1]] to be registered; if it be not in this respect, that they be of too fresh memory, which point I know very well will be a prejudice, as if this story were written in favour of the time present. But it shall suffice unto me, without betraying mine own name and memory or the liberty of a history, to procure this commendation to the time with posterity, namely, that a private man living in the same time should not doubt to publish an history of the time which should not carry any show or taste at all of flattery; a point noted for an infallible demonstration of a good time.

King Henry, the seventh of that name, after he had lived about fifty-two years, and thereof reigned twenty-three and some months, deceased of a consumption the 22nd day of April, in the palace which he had built at Ritchemount, in the year of our Redemption 1509.[2] This king attained unto the crown, not only from a private fortune, which mought endow him with moderation, but also from the fortune of an exiled man, which had quickened in him all seeds of observation and industry. His times were rather prosperous than calm, for he was assailed with many troubles, which

[1] These words are supplied from the Cabala.

[2] Both the MS. and the copy in the Cabala have 1504: an error probably of the transcriber: 4 carelessly written being very like 9.

he overcame happily; a matter that did no less set forth his wisdom than his fortune; and yet such a wisdom as seemed rather a dexterity to deliver himself from dangers when they pressed him, than any deep foresight to prevent them afar off. Jealous he was over the greatness of his Nobility, as remembering how himself was set up. And much more did this humour increase in him after he had conflicted with such idols and counterfeits as were Lambert Symnell and Perkin Warbeck: the strangeness of which dangers made him think nothing safe. Whereby he was forced to descend to the employment of secret espials and suborned conspirators, a necessary remedy against so dark and subtle practices; and not to be reprehended, except it were true which some report, that he had intelligence with confessors for the revealing of matters disclosed in confession. And yet if a man compare him with the kings his concurrents in France and Spain, he shall find him more politic than Lewis the Twelfth of France, and more entire and sincere than Ferdinando of Spain, upon whom notwithstanding he did handsomely bestow the envy of the death of Edward Plantagenet, Earl of Warwick. Great and devout reverence he bare unto religion, as he that employed ecclesiastical men in most of his affairs and negotiations; and as he that was brought hardly and very late to the abolishing of the privilege of sanctuaries in case of treason, and that not before he had obtained it by way of suit from Pope Alexander; which sanctuaries nevertheless had been the forges of most of his troubles. In his government he was led by none, scarcely by his laws, and yet he was a great observer of formality in all his proceedings, which

notwithstanding was no impediment to the working of his will; and in the suppressing and punishing of the treasons which during the whole course of his reign were committed against him, he had a very strange kind of interchanging of very large and unexpected pardons with severe executions; which (his wisdom considered) could not be imputed to any inconstancy or inequality, but to a discretion, or at least to a principle that he had apprehended, that it was good not obstinately to pursue one course, but to try both ways. In his wars, he seemed rather confident than enterprising, by which also commonly he was not the poorer; but generally he did seem inclinable to live in peace, and made but offers of war to mend the conditions of peace; and in the quenching of the commotions of his subjects he was ever ready to achieve those wars in person, sometimes reserving himself, but never retiring himself, but as ready to second. Of nature he coveted to accumulate treasure, which the people (into whom there is infused for the preservation of monarchies a natural desire to discharge their princes, though it be with the unjust charge of their counsellors and ministers,) did impute unto Cardinal Morton and Sir Reignold Bray, who (as it after appeared) as counsellors of ancient authority with him, did so second his humour as they tempered and refrained it. Whereas Empson and Dudley that followed (being persons that had no reputation with him, otherwise than the servile following of his own humour) gave him way and shaped him way to those extremities, wherewith himself was touched with remorse at his death, and which his successor disavowed. In expending of treasure he

never spared charge that his affairs required, and in his foundations was magnificent enough, but his rewards were very limited; so that his liberality was rather upon his own state and memory than towards the deserts of others. He chose commonly to employ cunning persons, as he that knew himself sufficient to make use of their uttermost reaches, without danger of being abused with them himself.

Here the MS., which is in a fair Roman hand, carefully written and punctuated, ends in the middle of the page, without any remark, and without any appearance of being finished, — just as if the transcriber had left off at the end of a sentence, intending to go on. I have no reason however to suppose that Bacon proceeded any further with the work. His increasing business as a lawyer, and perhaps also an increasing apprehension of the magnitude of his undertakings in philosophy, led him probably to relinquish it. The fragment remains however to show that his conception of the character of Henry in all its principal features was formed in his earlier life and under another sovereign; and therefore if it stands in need of excuse, we must seek for it elsewhere than in the circumstances suggested by Sir James Mackintosh. For my own part, I am satisfied with the conjecture that he thought it the true conception.

THE

HISTORIE OF THE RAIGNE

OF

KING HENRY THE SEVENTH.

WRITTEN BY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

FRANCIS LORD VERULAM, VISCOUNT ST. ALBAN.

LONDON:
Printed by W. Stansby, for Matthew Lownes and William Barret.
1622.

TO THE

MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND MOST EXCELLENT PRINCE

CHARLES,

PRINCE OF WALES, DUKE OF CORNWALL, EARL OF CHESTER, ETC.

It may please your Highness,

In part of my acknowledgment to your Highness, I have endeavoured to do honour to the memory of the last King of England that was ancestor to the King your father and yourself; and was that King to whom both Unions may in a sort refer: that of the Roses being in him consummate, and that of the Kingdoms by him begun. Besides, his times deserve it. For he was a wise man, and an excellent King; and yet the times were rough, and full of mutations and rare accidents. And it is with times as it is with ways. Some are more up-hill and down-hill, and some are more flat and plain; and the one is better for the liver, and the other for the writer. I have not flattered him, but took him to life as well as I could, sitting so far off, and having no better light. It is true, your Highness hath a living pattern, incomparable, of the King your father. But it is not amiss for you also to see one of these ancient pieces. God preserve your Highness.

Your Highness's most humble
and devoted servant,
FRANCIS ST. ALBAN.

THE

HISTORY OF THE REIGN

OF

KING HENRY THE SEVENTH.

AFTER that Richard, the third of that name, king in fact only, but tyrant both in title and regiment, and so commonly termed and reputed in all times since, was by the Divine Revenge, favouring the design of an exiled man, overthrown and slain at Bosworth Field;[1] there succeeded in the kingdom the Earl of Richmond, thenceforth styled Henry the Seventh. The King immediately after the victory, as one that had been bred under a devout mother, and was in his nature a great observer of religious forms, caused *Te deum laudamus* to be solemnly sung in the presence of the whole army upon the place, and was himself with general applause and great cries of joy, in a kind of militar[2] election or recognition, saluted King. Meanwhile the body of Richard after many indignities and reproaches (the dirigies and obsequies of the common

[1] August 22nd, 1485.

[2] *Militar* is the reading of the original edition: and is the form of the word which Bacon always, I believe, employed. He sometimes spells it *militare*, sometimes *militar*, but I think never *militarie*.

people towards tyrants) was obscurely buried. For though the King of his nobleness gave charge unto the friars of Leicester to see an honourable interment to be given to it, yet the religious people themselves (being not free from the humours of the vulgar) neglected it; wherein nevertheless they did not then incur any man's blame or censure. No man thinking any ignominy or contumely unworthy of him, that had been the executioner of King Henry the Sixth (that innocent Prince) with his own hands; the contriver of the death of the Duke of Clarence, his brother; the murderer of his two nephews (one of them his lawful King in the present, and the other in the future, failing of him); and vehemently suspected to have been the impoisoner of his wife, thereby to make vacant his bed for a marriage within the degrees forbidden.[1] And although he were a Prince in militar virtue approved, jealous of the honour of the English nation, and likewise a good law-maker for the ease and solace of the common people; yet his cruelties and parricides in the opinion of all men weighed down his virtues and merits; and in the opinion of wise men, even those virtues themselves were conceived to be rather feigned and affected things to serve his ambition, than true qualities ingenerate in his judgment or nature. And therefore it was noted by men of great understanding (who seeing his after-acts looked back upon his former proceedings) that even in the time of King Edward his brother he was not without secret trains and mines to turn envy and hatred upon his brother's govern-

[1] *i. e.* with Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Edward IV. The Latin translation has *incestuosas cum nepti nuptias.*

ment; as having an expectation and a kind of divination, that the King, by reason of his many disorders, could not be of long life, but was like to leave his sons of tender years; and then he knew well how easy a step it was from the place of a Protector and first Prince of the blood to the Crown. And that out of this deep root of ambition it sprang, that as well at the treaty of peace that passed between Edward the Fourth and Lewis the Eleventh of France, concluded by interview of both Kings at Piqueny, as upon all other occasions, Richard, then Duke of Gloucester, stood ever upon the side of honour,[1] raising his own reputation to the disadvantage of the King his brother, and drawing the eyes of all (especially of the nobles and soldiers) upon himself; as if the King by his voluptuous life and mean marriage were become effeminate, and less sensible of honour and reason of state than was fit for a King. And as for the politic and wholesome laws which were enacted in his time, they were interpreted to be but the brocage of an usurper,[2] thereby to woo and win the hearts of the people, as being conscious to himself that the true obligations of sovereignty[3] in him failed and were wanting. But King Henry, in the very entrance of his reign and the instant of time when the kingdom was cast into his arms, met with a point of great difficulty and knotty to solve, able to trouble and confound the wisest King in the newness of his estate; and so much the more, because it could not endure a deliberation, but

[1] *Pacem pro viribus impugnasset, et a parte honoris stetisset.*

[2] *Inescationes et lenocinia:* baits and panderings.

[3] *Verum obedientiæ subditorum vinculum: jus scilicet ad regnum legitimum:* the true bond which secures the obedience of subjects — a right to the throne.

must be at once deliberated and determined. There were fallen to his lot, and concurrent in his person, three several titles to the imperial crown. The first, the title of the Lady Elizabeth, with whom, by precedent pact[1] with the party that brought him in, he was to marry. The second, the ancient and long disputed title (both by plea and arms) of the house of Lancaster, to which he was inheritor in his own person.[2] The third, the title of the sword or conquest, for that he came in by victory of battle, and that the king in possession was slain in the field. The first of these was fairest, and most like to give contentment to the people, who by two-and-twenty years reign of King Edward the Fourth had been fully made capable[3] of the clearness of the title of the White Rose or house of York; and by the mild[4] and plausible reign of the same King towards his latter time, were become affectionate to that line. But then it lay plain before his eyes, that if he relied upon that title, he could be but a King at courtesy, and have rather a matrimonial than a regal power; the right remaining in his Queen, upon whose decease, either with issue or without issue,

[1] Such pact implying that it was in her right he should reign; as is more fully expressed in the Latin translation. "*Primus erat titulus reginæ suæ Elizabethæ: cui etiam accesserat pactum illud, quo se proceribus quorum auxiliis regnum adeptus est obstrinxerat, de nuptiis cum illa contrahendis, quod illum in jure ejus regnaturum haud obscure subinnuebat.*"

[2] In the Latin translation this expression is materially qualified. *Quarum alteri, Lancastriæ scilicet, ipse se pro hærede gerebat:* to which he considered himself as heir.

[3] *Opinionem penitus imbiberant.*

[4] Sir T. Meautys, in a letter to Bacon of 7th Jan. 1621–2, mentions, as one of the verbal corrections made in the MS. by the King, "*mild* instead of *debonnaire.*" This is probably the place. Compare the expression in Perkin's proclamation further on, "the blessed and debonair government of our noble father King Edward in his last times."

he was to give place and be removed. And though he should obtain by Parliament to be continued,[1] yet he knew there was a very great difference between a King that holdeth his crown by a civil act of estates, and one that holdeth it originally by the law of nature and descent of blood. Neither wanted there even at that time secret rumours and whisperings, (which afterwards gathered strength and turned to great troubles) that the two young sons of King Edward the Fourth, or one of them, (which were said to be destroyed in the Tower,) were not indeed murdered but conveyed secretly away, and were yet living: which, if it had been true, had prevented the title of the Lady Elizabeth. On the other side, if he stood upon his own title of the house of Lancaster, inherent in his person, he knew it was a title condemned by Parliament, and generally prejudged in the common opinion of the realm, and that it tended directly to the disinherison of the line of York, held then the indubiate[2] heirs of the crown. So that if he should have no issue by the Lady Elizabeth, which should be descendants of the double line, then[3] the ancient flames of discord and intestine wars, upon the competition of both houses, would again return and revive.

As for conquest, notwithstanding Sir William Stanley, after some acclamations of the soldiers in the field, had put a crown of ornament[4] (which Richard wore in the battle and was found amongst the spoils) upon

[1] *Licet magna spes subesset quod comitiorum suffragiis regnum in persona sua durante vita sua continuare et stabilire posset.*

[2] So in original.

[3] The original edition has *when*, which is manifestly wrong.

[4] *Non imperialem illam, sed quam ornamenti et ominis causa Ricardus secum in bellum attulerat.*

King Henry's head, as if there were his chief title; yet he remembered well upon what conditions and agreements he was brought in; and that to claim as conqueror was to put as well his own party as the rest into terror and fear; as that which gave him power of disannulling of laws, and disposing of men's fortunes and estates, and the like points of absolute power being in themselves so harsh and odious, as that William himself, commonly called the Conqueror, howsoever he used and exercised the power of a conqueror to reward his Normans, yet he forbare to use that claim in the beginning,[1] but mixed it with a titulary pretence, grounded upon the will and designation of Edward the Confessor. But the King, out of the greatness of his own mind, presently cast the die; and the inconveniences appearing unto him on all parts, and knowing there could not be any interreign or suspension of title, and preferring his affection to his own line and blood, and liking[2] that title best which made him independent, and being in his nature and constitution of mind not very apprehensive or forecasting of future events afar off, but an entertainer of fortune by the day, resolved to rest upon the title of Lancaster as the main, and to use the other two, that of marriage and that of battle, but as supporters, the one to appease secret discontents, and the other to beat down open murmur and dispute; not forgetting that the same title of Lancaster had formerly maintained a possession of three descents in the crown;

[1] *Verbo tamen abstinuerit, neque hoc jure se regnum tenere unquam professus sit, sed illud titulari quodam prætextu velaverit.*

[2] In the translation it is put thus: *Sive amori erga familiam suam reliqua posthabens. sive &c.*

and might have proved a perpetuity, had it not ended in the weakness and inability of the last prince. Whereupon the King presently that very day, being the two and twentieth of August, assumed the style of King in his own name, without mention of the Lady Elizabeth at all, or any relation thereunto. In which course he ever after persisted: which did spin him a thread of many seditions and troubles. The King, full of these thoughts, before his departure from Leicester, despatched Sir Robert Willoughby to the castle of Sheriff-Hutton, in Yorkshire, where were kept in safe custody, by King Richard's commandment, both the Lady Elizabeth, daughter of King Edward,[1] and Edward Plantagenet, son and heir to George Duke of Clarence. This Edward was by the King's warrant delivered from the constable of the castle to the hand of Sir Robert Willoughby; and by him with all safety and diligence conveyed to the Tower of London, where he was shut up close prisoner. Which act of the King's (being an act merely of policy and power) proceeded not so much from any apprehension he had of Dr. Shaw's tale at Paul's Cross for the bastarding of Edward the Fourth's issues, in which case this young gentleman was to succeed,[2] (for that fable was ever exploded,) but upon a settled disposition to depress all eminent persons of the line of York. Wherein still the King, out of strength of will or weakness of judgment, did use to shew a little more of the party than of the king.

[1] Whom he had agreed to marry: — *Edwardi filia ad nuptias Henrico destinata.*

[2] *Proximus fuisset regni hæres:* would have been next heir of the Crown.

For the Lady Elizabeth, she received also a direction to repair with all convenient speed to London, and there to remain with the Queen dowager her mother; which accordingly she soon after did, accompanied with many noblemen and ladies of honour. In the mean season the King set forwards by easy journeys to the City of London, receiving the acclamations and applauses of the people as he went, which indeed were true and unfeigned, as might well appear in the very demonstrations and fulness of the cry. For they thought generally that he was a Prince as ordained and sent down from heaven to unite and put to an end the long dissensions of the two houses; which although they had had, in the times of Henry the Fourth, Henry the Fifth, and a part of Henry the Sixth on the one side, and the times of Edward the Fourth on the other, lucid intervals and happy pauses; yet they did ever hang over the kingdom, ready to break forth into new perturbations and calamities. And as his victory gave him the knee, so his purpose of marriage with the Lady Elizabeth gave him the heart; so that both knee and heart did truly bow before him.

He on the other side with great wisdom (not ignorant of the affections and fears of the people), to disperse the conceit and terror of a conquest, had given order that there should be nothing in his journey like unto a warlike march or manner; but rather like unto the progress of a King in full peace and assurance.[1]

He entered the City upon a Saturday, as he had also obtained the victory upon a Saturday; which day

[1] *Sed potius itineris pacifici, quali reges animi causa provincias suas peragrantes uti solent.* "Progress" is used in its technical sense.

of the week, first upon an observation, and after upon memory and fancy, he accounted and chose as a day prosperous unto him.

The mayor[1] and companies of the City received him at Shoreditch; whence with great and honourable attendance, and troops of noblemen and persons of quality, he entered the City; himself not being on horseback, or in any open chair or throne, but in a close chariot; as one that having been sometimes an enemy to the whole state, and a proscribed person, chose rather to keep state and strike a reverence into the people than to fawn upon them.

He went first into St. Paul's Church, where, not meaning that the people should forget too soon that he came in by battle, he made offertory of his standards, and had orizons and *Te Deum* again sung; and went to his lodging prepared in the Bishop of London's palace, where he stayed for a time.

During his abode there, he assembled his counsel[2] and other principal persons, in presence of whom he did renew again his promise to marry with the Lady Elizabeth. This he did the rather, because having at

[1] *Major* in original.

[2] In the edition of 1622 this word is in this place spelt *counsell:* in other places it is spelt *councell;* which is almost always the spelling of the MS. According to modern usage it would of course be spelt here *council.* But the modern distinction between *council* and *counsel, councillor* and *counsellor*, was not observed in Bacon's time; at least not marked in the spelling. Some wrote both words with an *s;* some both with a *c;* some either with either. But the rule by which the several forms of the word are appropriated to its several meanings, — *counsel* being used for advice, *counsellor* for a person who gives advice, *council* for a board of counsellors, *councillor* for a member of such board, — this rule was not yet established; and as it sometimes happens that the point or effect of the sentence depends upon the ambiguity, and is lost by marking the distinction, I have thought it better to retain the same form in all cases: and I have chosen that form which represents in modern orthography the original word.

his coming out of Brittaine given artificially for serving of his own turn some hopes, in case he obtained the kingdom, to marry Anne, inheritress to the duchy of Brittaine, whom Charles the Eighth of France soon after married, it bred some doubt and suspicion amongst divers that he was not sincere, or at least not fixed, in going on with the match of England so much desired: which conceit also, though it were but talk and discourse, did much afflict the poor Lady Elizabeth herself. But howsoever he both truly intended it, and desired also it should be so believed (the better to extinguish envy and contradiction to his other purposes), yet was he resolved in himself not to proceed to the consummation thereof, till his coronation and a Parliament were past. The one, lest a joint coronation of himself and his Queen might give any countenance of participation of title; the other, lest in the entailing of the crown to himself, which he hoped to obtain by Parliament, the votes of the Parliament might any ways reflect upon her.

About this time in autumn, towards the end of September, there began and reigned in the city and other parts of the kingdom a disease then new;[1] which by the accidents and manner thereof they called the *sweating-sickness*. This disease had a swift course, both in the sick body and in the time and period of the lasting thereof.[2] For they that were taken with it, upon four-and-twenty hours, escaping were thought almost assured. And as to the time of the malice and reign of the disease ere it ceased, it

[1] *Morbus quidam epidemicus, tanc temporis novus; cui ex naturâ et symptomatibus ejus, &c.*

[2] *Tam in morbi ipsius crisi, quam in tempore durationis ipsius.*

began about the one and twentieth of September, and cleared up before the end of October; insomuch as it was no hinderance to the King's coronation, which was the last of October; nor (which was more) to the holding of the Parliament, which began but seven days after. It was a pestilent fever, but as it seemeth not seated in the veins or humours; for that there followed no carbuncle, no purple or livid spots,[1] or the like, the mass of the body being not tainted; only a malign vapour flew to the heart, and seized the vital spirits; which stirred nature to strive to send it forth by an extreme sweat. And it appeared by experience that this disease was rather a surprise of nature, than obstinate to remedies, if it were in time looked unto. For if the patient were kept in an equal temper, both for clothes, fire, and drink moderately warm, with temperate cordials, whereby nature's work were neither irritated by heat nor turned back by cold, he commonly recovered. But infinite persons died suddenly of it, before the manner of the cure and attendance was known. It was conceived not to be an epidemic disease,[2] but to proceed from a malignity in the constitution of the air, gathered by the predispositions of seasons;[3] and the speedy cessation declared as much.

[1] The Latin translation adds *non pustulæ.*

[2] The word *epidemic* is mentioned by Sir T. Meautys as one of the verbal corrections made by the King in the original MS. This part of the MS. is unluckily lost; we cannot therefore ascertain whether this be the place where that word was introduced, or what the word was for which it was substituted. Bacon's meaning however is fully explained in the Latin translation, in which it has already been described as an epidemic disease. *Opinio erat morbum istum neutiquam ex epidemicis illis qui simul contagiosi sunt et de corpore in corpus fluunt fuisse: sed a malignitate quadam in ipso aere, &c.* Using the words in their modern sense, we should say that it was thought not to be a contagious but an epidemic disease.

[3] The translation adds "and frequent and unhealthy changes of weather."

On Simon and Jude's Even the King dined with Thomas Bourchier, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Cardinal: and from Lambeth went by land over the bridge to the Tower, where the morrow after he made twelve knights-bannerets. But for creations, he dispensed them with a sparing hand. For notwithstanding a field so lately fought and a coronation so near at hand, he only created three: Jasper Earl of Pembroke (the King's uncle) was created Duke of Bedford; Thomas the Lord Stanley (the King's father-in-law) Earl of Derby; and Edward Courtney Earl of Devon; though the king had then nevertheless a purpose in himself to make more in time of Parliament; bearing a wise and decent respect to distribute his creations, some to honour his coronation, and some his Parliament.

The coronation followed two days after, upon the thirtieth day of October in the year of our Lord 1485. At which time Innocent the Eighth was Pope of Rome; Frederick the Third Emperor of Almain; and Maximilian his son newly chosen King of the Romans; Charles the Eighth King of France; Ferdinando and Isabella Kings of Spain; and James the Third King of Scotland: with all of which kings and states the King was at that time in good peace and amity.[1] At which day also (as if the crown upon his head had put perils into his thoughts) he did institute for the better security of his person a band of fifty archers under a captain to attend him, by the name

[1] There seems to have been a doubt at first how he stood with regard to Scotland; for on the 25th of September, 1485, commissions were issued to the Sheriffs of Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, Yorkshire, and Nottingham, "to hold in array the men of those counties in readiness for an anticipated invasion of the Scots," &c. See Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1 Hen. VII. Rolls Chapel.

of Yeomen-of-his-Guard: and yet that it might be thought to be rather a matter of dignity, after the imitation of that he had known abroad, than any matter of diffidence appropriate to his own case, he made it to be understood for an ordinance not temporary, but to hold in succession for ever after.

The seventh of November the King held his Parliament at Westminster, which he had summoned immediately after his coming to London. His ends in calling a Parliament (and that so speedily) were chiefly three. First, to procure the crown to be entailed upon himself. Next to have the attainders of all his party (which were in no small number) reversed, and all acts of hostility by them done in his quarrel remitted and discharged; and on the other side, to attaint[1] by Parliament the heads and principals of his enemies. The third, to calm and quiet the fears of the rest of that party by a general pardon;[2] not being ignorant in how great danger a King stands from his subjects, when most of his subjects are conscious in themselves that they stand in his danger.[3]

[1] In the original it is spelt "attaine;" probably a misprint.

[2] This is explained in the translation to mean such a general pardon as was usual after a Parliament. *Ut inferioris conditionis homines qui Richardo adhæserant (ne forte novis motibus materiam præberet) remissionem generalem, qualis in fine comitiorum a rege emanare solet, consequerentur.* The nature of this general pardon is further explained in the *Index vocabulorum* appended to the translation. It is defined, *indulgentia Regis, qua et crimina omnia (exceptis quæ in instrumento remissionis speciatim recensentur) et mulctæ, aliæque solutiones Regi debitæ, abolentur.* And it is added that it may proceed either from the King alone or from the King and Parliament. *Illa quandoque a Rege solo emanat, quandoque a Rege addita auctoritate Parliamenti.* It seems that Henry's first intention was to take the latter method; but that he changed his mind. See p. 62.

[3] In the MS. the sentence stood originally thus,—"that they stand in danger from him." The alteration (which I think is no improvement) is not in the transcriber's hand nor in Bacon's; but apparently in the same

Unto these three special motives of a Parliament was added, that he as a prudent and moderate prince made this judgment, that it was fit for him to haste to let his people see that he meant to govern by law, howsoever he came in by the sword; and fit also to reclaim them to know him for their King, whom they had so lately talked of as an enemy or banished man. For that which concerned the entailing of the crown (more than that he was true to his own will, that he would not endure any mention of the Lady Elizabeth, no not in the nature of special entail[1]), he carried it otherwise with great wisdom and measure. For he did not press to have the act penned by way of declaration or recognition of right; as on the other side he avoided to have it by new law or ordinance; but chose rather a kind of middle way, by way of establishment, and that under covert and indifferent words;[2] *that the inheritance of the crown should rest, remain, and abide in the King, etc.:* which words might equally be applied, That the crown should continue to him;[3] but whether as having former right to it (which was doubtful), or having it then in fact and possession (which no man denied), was left fair to interpretation

in which the direction with regard to the omitted passage on page 60 is written. I suppose it was one of the verbal corrections dictated by the King.

From this place to the foot of page 67, I have corrected the text from the MS. The leaves which preceded are lost.

[1] *Imo nec quod minimum erat permittens, ut liberi ex eâ suscepti primi ante omnes succederent.*

[2] *Verbis tectis et utrinque nutantibus.*

[3] The meaning is more accurately expressed in the Latin translation: *Quæ verba in utrumque sensum trahi poterant; illud commune habentia, ut scilicet corona in eo stabiliretur; sed utrum, &c.* The words might be taken two ways; but either way they must be taken as establishing the crown upon him.

either way. And again for the limitation of the entail, he did not press it to go farther than to himself and to the heirs of his body, not speaking of his right heirs;[1] but leaving that to the law to decide; so as the entail might seem rather a personal favour to him and his children, than a total disinherison to the house of York. And in this form was the law drawn and passed. Which statute he procured to be confirmed by the Pope's Bull the year following, with mention nevertheless (by way of recital) of his other titles both of descent and conquest. So as now the wreath of three was made a wreath of five. For to the three first titles, of the two houses or lines and conquest, were added two more; the authorities Parliamentary and Papal.

The King likewise in the reversal of the attainders of his partakers, and discharging them of all offences incident to his service and succour, had his will; and acts did pass accordingly. In the passage whereof, exception was taken to divers persons in the House of Commons, for that they were attainted, and thereby not legal, nor habilitate to serve in Parliament, being disabled in the highest degree;[2] and that it should be a great incongruity to have them to make laws who themselves were not inlawed. The truth was, that divers of those which had in the time of King Richard been strongest and most declared for the King's party,

[1] *Omissâ hæredum generalium mentione, sed illud legis decisioni, qualis ex verbis antedictis elici poterat, subjiciebat.*

[2] This is rather fuller and clearer in the Latin. *Cum vero Statutum illud esset sub incude, intervenit quæstio juris satis subtilis. Dubitatum est enim, utrum suffragia complurium in inferiori consessu tunc existentium valida essent et legitima, eo quod proditionis tempore Richardi damnati fuissent; unde incapaces et inhabiles redditi essent in summo gradu.*

were returned Knights and Burgesses of the Parliament; whether by care or recommendation from the state, or the voluntary inclination of the people; many of which had been by Richard the Third attainted by outlawries, or otherwise. The King was somewhat troubled with this. For though it had a grave and specious show, yet it reflected upon his party. But wisely not shewing himself at all moved therewith, he would not understand it but as a case in law, and wished the judges to be advised thereupon, who for that purpose were forthwith assembled in the Exchequer-chamber[1] (which is the counsel-chamber of the judges), and upon deliberation they gave a grave and safe opinion and advice, mixed with law and convenience;[2] which was, that the knights and burgesses attainted by the course of law should forbear to come into the house till a law were passed for the reversal of their attainders. [But the judges left it there, and made no mention whether after such reversal there should need any new election or no, nor whether this sequestering of them from the house were generally upon their disability, or upon an incompetency that they should be judges and parties in their own cause. The point in law was, whether any disability in their natural capacity could trench to their politic capacity, they being but procurators of the commonwealth and representatives and fiduciaries of counties and boroughs; considering their principals stood upright and

[1] The *index vocabulorum* explains, for the benefit of foreigners, that the exchequer chamber was *locus in quo judices majores conveniunt; cum aut a rege consuluntur; aut propter vota æqualia in curiis minoribus, omnes deliberant et suffragia reddunt; aut minorum curiarum judicia retractant.*

[2] *Ex legum normâ et æquitate naturali temperatam.*

clear, and therefore were not to receive prejudice from their personal attainders.[1]]

It was at that time incidentally moved amongst the judges in their consultation, what should be done for the King himself who likewise was attainted: but it was with unanimous consent resolved, that the crown takes away all defects and stops in blood: and that from the time the King did assume the crown, the fountain was cleared, and all attainders and corruption of blood discharged.[2] But nevertheless, for honour's sake, it was ordained by Parliament, that all records wherein there was any memory or mention of the King's attainder should be defaced, cancelled, and taken off the file.

But on the part of the King's enemies there were by parliament attainted,[3] the late Duke of Gloucester,

[1] The passage within brackets is taken from the MS.; where it is crossed out; and against the last sentence is written in the margin, in a hand which I do not know (not Bacon's, as it is supposed to be by Sir Frederic Madden, Archæol. 27, 155), "This to be altered, as his Maties told Mr. Mewtus."

Mr. Meautys, in a letter to Bacon, 7th Jan. 1621-2, says, "Mr. Murray tells me that the King hath given your book to my Lord Brooke, and enjoined him to read it, commending it much to him, and then my Lord Brooke is to return it to your Lp., and so it may go to the press when your Lp. please, with such amendments as the King hath made, which I have seen, and are very few, and these rather words, as *epidemic*, and *mild* instead of *debonnaire*, &c. Only that, of persons attainted enabled to serve in Parliament by a bare reversal of their attainders without issuing any new writs, the King by all means will have left out." This is what Lord Campbell alludes to where he says that James made Bacon "expunge a *legal axiom*, 'that on the reversal of an attainder the party attainted is restored to all his rights.'" — *Lives*, iii. 122. 4th ed.

[2] The translation adds *ut Regi operâ Parliamentariâ non fuisset opus.*

[3] It is remarkable that in the act of attainder the 21st of August (the day *before* the battle of Bosworth) is spoken of as being in the first year of Henry's reign; and that, a few lines further on, the 22nd of August is called "the *said* 22nd day of the said month then following." The expressions are plainly irreconcilable; but I suppose it is only a clerical error or

calling himself Richard the Third, the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Surrey, Viscount Lovell, the Lord Ferrers, the Lord Zouch, Richard Ratcliffe, William Catesby, and many others of degree and quality. In which bills of attainders nevertheless there were contained many just and temperate clauses, savings, and provisoes; well shewing and fore-tokening the wisdom, stay, and moderation of the King's spirit of government. And for the pardon of the rest that had stood against the King, the King upon a second advice thought it not fit it should pass by Parliament,[1] the better (being matter of grace), to impropriate the thanks to himself: using only the opportunity of a Parliament time, the better to disperse it into the veins of the kingdom. Therefore during the Parliament he published his royal proclamation, offering pardon and grace of restitution to all such as had taken arms or been participant of any attempts against him, so as they submitted themselves to his mercy by a day, and took the oath of allegiance and fidelity to him, whereupon many came out of sanctuary, and many more

a misprint, and that "the said 22nd day of the said month" should have been "the 22nd day of the said month," &c.

The author of the *Pictorial History of England* (book vi. cap. i.) thinks that the date of Henry's accession was thus antedated by a day, because if he was not king on the 21st, acts done on the 21st could not have been treason against him. The truth is, it mattered little by what fiction the law chose to bring within its forms a case in itself so utterly irreconcilable with law as a successful rebellion against the *de facto* king. To suppose that Henry had assumed the crown from the day when he was prepared to contest it in the field, was perhaps that form of fiction which came nearest to the truth.

For a fuller account of the discrepant evidence as to the commencement of Henry's regnal year, see Sir Harris Nicolas's *Chronology of History*, pp. 328–333.

[1] *A Parliamentariâ auctoritate promanaret.* See note 2. p. 57.

came out of fear, no less guilty than those that had taken sanctuary.

As for money or treasure, the King thought it not seasonable or fit to demand any of his subjects at this Parliament; both because he had received satisfaction from them in matters of so great importance, and because he could not remunerate them with any general pardon (being prevented therein by the coronation pardon passed immediately before); but chiefly, for that it was in every man's eye what great forfeitures and confiscations he had at that present to help himself; whereby those casualties of the crown might in reason spare the purses of the subject; specially in a time when he was in peace with all his neighbours. Some few laws passed at that Parliament, almost for form sake: amongst which there was one, to reduce aliens being made denizens to pay strangers' customs; and another, to draw to himself the seizures and compositions of Italians' goods, for not employment;[1] being points of profit to his coffers, whereof from the very beginning he was not forgetful; and had been more happy at the latter end, if his early providence, which kept him from all necessity of exacting upon his people, could likewise have attempered his nature

[1] *i. e.* for not being employed upon the purchase of native goods; that being the condition upon which the importation was allowed.

The Latin translation, being addressed to foreigners, gives a fuller and more exact description of many of these laws than was then necessary for English readers. English readers want the explanation now as much as foreigners; and therefore I shall in most cases give the Latin words by way of commentary.

Una fuit, ut exteri licet civitate donati nihilominus vectigalia qualia imponi solent meris exteris solverent: altera, ut mulctæ mercatorum Italorum propter pecunias quæ proveniebant ex mercibus suis venundatis in nativas regni merces non impensas, fisco regio applicarentur.

therein. He added during parliament to his former creations the ennoblement or advancement in nobility of a few others. The Lord Chandos of Brittaine was made Earl of Bath; Sir Giles Dawbigny was made Lord Dawbigny; and Sir Robert Willoughby Lord Brooke.

The King did also with great nobleness and bounty (which virtues at that time had their turns in his nature) restore Edward Stafford eldest son to Henry Duke of Buckingham, attainted in the time of King Richard, not only to his dignities, but to his fortunes and possessions, which were great; to which he was moved also by a kind of gratitude, for that the Duke was the man that moved the first stone against the tyranny of King Richard, and indeed made the King a bridge to the crown upon his own ruins. Thus the Parliament brake up.

The Parliament being dissolved, the King sent forthwith money to redeem the Marquis Dorset and Sir John Bourchier, whom he had left as his pledges at Paris for money which he had borrowed when he made his expedition for England; and thereupon he took a fit occasion to send the Lord Treasurer and Mr. Bray (whom he used as counsellor) to the Lord Mayor of London, requiring of the City a prest of six thousand marks. But after many parleys he could obtain but two thousand pounds; which nevertheless the King took in good part, as men use to do that practise to borrow money when they have no need.

About this time the King called unto his Privy Counsel John Morton and Richard Foxe, the one Bishop of Ely, the other Bishop of Exeter; vigilant men and secret, and such as kept watch with him al-

most upon all men else. They had been both versed in his affairs before he came to the crown, and were partakers of his adverse fortune. This Morton soon after, upon the death of Bourchier, he made Archbishop of Canterbury. And for Foxe, he made him Lord Keeper of his Privy Seal; and afterwards advanced him by degrees, from Exeter to Bath and Wells, thence to Durham, and last to Winchester. For although the King loved to employ and advance bishops, because having rich bishoprics they carried their reward upon themselves; yet he did use to raise them by steps; that he might not lose the profit of the first fruits,[1] which by that course of gradation was multiplied.

At last upon the eighteenth of January was solemnised the so long expected and so much desired marriage between the King and the Lady Elizabeth; which day of marriage was celebrated with greater triumph and demonstrations (especially on the people's part) of joy and gladness, than the days either of his entry or coronation; which the King rather noted than liked. And it is true that all his life-time, while the Lady Elizabeth lived with him (for she died before him), he shewed himself no very indulgent husband[2] towards her though

[1] *i. e.* the portion of the profit which he contrived to secure for himself. The first-fruits at that time went to the Pope, as is noticed in the Latin translation, which adds, "*Licet enim tunc temporis reditus ille ex primitiis reditibus regiis non fuisset annexus, sed tributo papali cesserat; attamen ipse ita cum collectoribus Papæ se gerere solebat, ut haud parvum inde commodum sibi redundaret.*"

[2] So again farther on: "Towards his queen he was nothing uxorious, nor scarce indulgent; but companiable and respective, and without jealousy."

I am not aware that any evidence is now extant from which it could be inferred that Henry was wanting in indulgence to his wife; but these words are evidently chosen with care and delicacy, and we need not

she was beautiful gentle and fruitful. But his aversion toward the house of York was so predominant in him,

doubt that Bacon had good grounds for what he said. These passages are, I believe, the sole foundation of the statements made by later historians on this point; a few of which (to show how little the copy can be trusted for preserving the characteristic features of the original) it may be worth while to quote, according to the order of their date. The successive pictures are not however copies from each other, but all *meant to be* copies direct from Bacon.

1 Rapin (A. D. 1707–25). "Henry did not like to see the people's joy for this marriage. He perceived Elizabeth had a greater share in it than himself, and consequently he was thought really king only in right of his queen. This consideration inspired him with *such a coldness for her, that he never ceased giving her marks of it so long as she lived.* He deferred her coronation two whole years, and doubtless would have done so for ever, if he had not thought it prejudicial to him to persist in refusing her that honour. Nay *perhaps he would have dealt with her as Edward the Confessor had formerly done by his queen, daughter of Earl Goodwin, had not the desire of children caused him to overcome his aversion.*"

2. Hume (1759). "Henry remarked with much displeasure the general favour which was borne the house of York. The suspicions which arose from it not only disturbed his tranquillity during his whole reign, but *bred disgust towards his spouse herself, and poisoned all his domestic enjoyments.* Though virtuous, amiable, and obsequious to the last degree, she never met with a proper return of affection, *or even of complaisance*, from her husband; and the malignant ideas of faction still. in his sullen mind, prevailed over all the sentiments of conjugal tenderness."

3. Henry (1790). "Henry did not relish these rejoicings; on the contrary they gave great disgust to his jealous and sullen spirit; as they convinced him that the house of York was still the favourite of the people, and that his young and beautiful consort possessed a greater share of their affections than himself. This, it is said, deprived her of the affections of her husband, who *treated her unkindly during her life.*"

4. Thomas Heywood (Preface to the *Song of the Lady Bessy*, p. 15.), (1829). "It was a match of policy; and the gentle and unoffending queen, *after a life rendered miserable by the dislike in which the king held her* in common with the whole of the house of York, and having given birth to three sons and four daughters, died in the Tower, A. D. 1503, in the 37th year of her age," &c.

"I have not met" (says Dr. Lingard, after quoting a passage of opposite tendency) "with any good proof of Henry's dislike of Elizabeth, so often mentioned by later writers. In the MS. of André and the journals of the Herald they appear as if they entertained a real affection for each other." (Vol. v. p. 328.)

If Bacon be, as I suppose he is, the sole authority upon which these

as it found place not only in his wars and counsels, but in his chamber and bed.

Towards the middle of the spring,[1] the King, full of confidence and assurance, as a prince that had been victorious in battle, and had prevailed with his Parliament in all that he desired, and had the ring of acclamations fresh in his ears, thought the rest of his reign should be but play, and the enjoying of a kingdom. Yet as a wise and watchful King, he would not neglect anything for his safety, thinking nevertheless to perform all things now rather as an exercise than as a labour. So he being truly informed that the northern parts were not only affectionate to the house of York, but particularly had been devoted to King Richard the Third, thought it would be a summer well spent to visit those parts, and by his presence and application of himself[2] to reclaim and rectify those humours. But the King, in his account of peace and calms, did much over-cast his fortunes; which proved for many years together full of broken seas, tides, and tempests. For he was no sooner come to Lincoln, where he kept his Easter, but he received news that the Lord Lovell, Humphrey Stafford, and Thomas Stafford, who had formerly taken sanctuary at[3] Colchester, were departed out of sanctuary, but to what place no man could tell. Which advertisement the King despised,

later writers speak, proof was not to be expected. Bacon does not say that Henry was either neglectful or unkind, but only that he was not very indulgent.

[1] In the Latin, *jam autem*. Easter-day fell that year on the 26th of March; and by that time the king had advanced in his northern progress as far as Lincoln.

[2] *Præsentiaque sua, et majestate simul ac comitate.*

[3] Several pages of the MS. that followed here are lost.

and continued his journey to York. At York[1] there came fresh and more certain advertisement that the Lord Lovell was at hand with a great power of men, and that the Staffords were in arms in Worcestershire, and had made their approaches to the city of Worcester to assail it. The King, as a prince of great and profound judgment, was not much moved with it; for that he thought it was but a rag or remnant of Bosworth Field, and had nothing in it of the main party of the house of York. But he was more doubtful of the raising of forces to resist the rebels, than of the resistance itself;[2] for that he was in a core of people whose affections he suspected. But the action enduring no delay, he did speedily levy and send against the Lord Lovell to the number of three thousand men, ill armed but well assured (being taken some few out of his own train, and the rest out of the tenants and followers of such as were safe to be trusted), under the conduct of the Duke of Bedford. And as his manner was to send his pardons rather before the sword than after, he gave commission to the Duke to proclaim pardon to all that would come in: which the Duke, upon his approach to the Lord Lovell's camp, did perform. And it fell out as the King expected; the heralds were the great ordnance. For the Lord Lovell, upon proclamation of pardon, mistrusting his men, fled into Lancashire, and lurking for a time with Sir

[1] So Polydore Vergil. According to the journal of a herald who accompanied the progress (printed in Leland's Collectanea, vol. iv., from Cott. MSS. Jul. B. xii.), which is better authority, news reached the king at Pontefract that Lord Lovel had passed him on the road, and was preparing to surprise him at York.

[2] *i. e.* than that the rebels might easily be resisted. "*Magis autem solicitum eum habuit copiarum delectus quibus resisteret rebellibus quam ipsorum rebellium debellatio.*"

Thomas Broughton, after sailed over into Flanders to the Lady Margaret. And his men, forsaken of their captain, did presently submit themselves to the Duke. The Staffords likewise, and their forces, hearing what had happened to the Lord Lovell (in whose success their chief trust was), despaired and dispersed; the two brothers taking sanctuary at Colnham, a village near Abingdon; which place, upon view of their privilege in the King's bench, being judged no sufficient sanctuary for traitors, Humphrey was executed at Tyburn; and Thomas, as being led by his elder brother, was pardoned. So this rebellion proved but a blast, and the King having by this journey purged a little the dregs and leaven of the northern people, that were before in no good affection towards him, returned to London.

In September following, the Queen was delivered of her first son, whom the King (in honour of the British race, of which himself was) named Arthur, according to the name of that ancient worthy King of the Britons; in whose acts there is truth enough to make him famous, besides that which is fabulous.[1] The child was strong and able, though he was born in the eighth month, which the physicians do prejudge.[2]

There followed this year, being the second of the King's reign, a strange accident of state,[3] whereof the relations which we have are so naked, as they leave it scarce credible; not for the nature of it, (for it hath

[1] *In cujus rebus gestis asserendis satis invenitur in historia vera et monumentis antiquis, quod illum, demptis fabulis, magnâ gloriâ regnasse testetur.*

[2] *De quo medici et astrologi male ominantur.*

[3] *Mirum quoddam facinus et audacia plenum, quodque statum regis et regni vehementer perturbavit.*

fallen out oft,) but for the manner and circumstance of it, especially in the beginnings. Therefore we shall make our judgment upon the things themselves, as they give light one to another, and (as we can) dig truth out of the mine. The King was green in his estate; and contrary to his own opinion and desert both, was not without much hatred throughout the realm. The root of all was the discountenancing of the house of York, which the general body of the realm still affected. This did alienate the hearts of the subjects from him daily more and more, especially when they saw that after his marriage, and after a son born, the King did nevertheless not so much as proceed to the coronation of the Queen,[1] not vouchsafing her the honour of a matrimonial crown; for the coronation of her was not till almost two years after, when danger had taught him what to do. But much more, when it was spread abroad (whether by error or the cunning of malcontents) that the King had a purpose to put to death Edward Plantagenet closely in the Tower: whose case was so nearly paralleled with that of Edward the Fourth's children, in respect of the blood, like age, and the very place of the Tower, as it did refresh and reflect upon the King a most odious resemblance, as if he would be another King Richard. And all this time it was still whispered everywhere, that at least one of the children of Edward the Fourth was living. Which bruit was cunningly fomented by such as desired innovation. Neither was the King's nature and customs greatly fit to disperse these mists; but contrariwise he had a fashion rather to create

[1] *Nihilominus coronationem reginæ suæ (quæ conjunctim cum coronatione propria ab omnibus primo erat spectata) adhuc distulisse.*

doubts than assurance. Thus was fuel prepared for the spark: the spark, that afterwards kindled such a fire and combustion, was at the first contemptible.

There was a subtile priest called Richard Simon, that lived in Oxford, and had to his pupil a baker's son [1] named Lambert Simnell, of the age of some fifteen years; a comely youth, and well favoured, not without some extraordinary dignity and grace of aspect. It came into this priest's fancy (hearing what men talked, and in hope to raise himself to some great bishoprick) to cause this lad to counterfeit and personate the second son of Edward the Fourth, supposed to be murdered; and afterward (for he changed his intention in the manage) the Lord Edward Plantagenet, then prisoner in the Tower; and accordingly to frame him and instruct him in the part he was to play. This is that which (as was touched before) seemeth scarcely credible; not that a false person should be assumed to gain a kingdom, for it hath been seen in ancient and late times; nor that it should come into the mind of such an abject fellow to enterprise so great a matter; for high conceits do sometimes come streaming into the imaginations of base persons; especially when they are drunk with news and talk of the people. But here is that which hath no appearance; [2] that this priest, being utterly unacquainted

[1] Speed, on the authority it seems of Bernard Andrè, says son of a baker or shoemaker. Archbishop Sancroft, on the authority of the priest's declaration before the convocation of clergy, Feb. 17, 1486 (*Reg. Morton.* f. 34.), says that he was the son of an organ-maker in Oxford, and that the priest's name was William Simonds. See note on this passage in Blackbourne's ed. of Bacon's works, vol. iii. p. 407., said to be from Sancroft's MS. In the act of attainder of the Earl of Lincoln (Rolls of Parl. vol. vi. p. 397.) he is styled "one Lambert Symnell, a child of x yere of age, sonne to Thomas Symnell, late of Oxford, joynoure."

[2] *Quod minime videtur probabile.*

with the true person according to whose pattern he should shape his counterfeit, should think it possible for him to instruct his player, either in gesture and fashions, or in recounting past matters of his life and education, or in fit answers to questions, or the like, any ways to come near the resemblance of him whom he was to represent. For this lad was not to personate one that had been long before taken out of his cradle, or conveyed away in his infancy, known to few; but a youth that till the age almost of ten years had been brought up in a court where infinite eyes had been upon him. For King Edward, touched with remorse of his brother the Duke of Clarence's death, would not indeed restore his son (of whom we speak) to be Duke of Clarence, but yet created him Earl of Warwick, reviving his honour on the mother's side, and used him honourably during his time, though Richard the Third afterwards confined him. So that it cannot be, but that some great person, that knew particularly and familiarly Edward Plantagenet, had a hand in the business, from whom the priest might take his aim. That which is most probable, out of the precedent and subsequent acts, is, that it was the Queen Dowager from whom this action had the principal source and motion. For certain it is, she was a busy negotiating woman, and in her withdrawing-chamber had the fortunate conspiracy for the King against King Richard the Third been hatched; which the King knew, and remembered perhaps but too well; and was at this time extremely discontent with the King, thinking her daughter (as the King handled the matter) not advanced but depressed: and none could hold the book so well to prompt and instruct this stage-play, as she

could. Nevertheless it was not her meaning, nor no more was it the meaning of any of the better and sager sort that favoured this enterprise and knew the secret, that this disguised idol should possess the crown; but at his peril to make way to the overthrow of the King; and that done, they had their several hopes and ways. That which doth chiefly fortify this conjecture is, that as soon as the matter brake forth in any strength, it was one of the King's first acts to cloister the Queen Dowager in the nunnery of Bermondsey, and to take away all her lands and estate;[1] and this by a close counsel, without any legal proceeding, upon far-fetched

[1] This is distinctly stated by Polydore Vergil, Hall, and Speed. Dr. Lingard disputes the fact, referring to the collection of unpublished Acts by Rymer; Hen. VII. Nos. 29, 39. Her dower (he says), of which she had been deprived by Richard III., had not been restored by Henry's parliament: instead of it the king granted her a compensation. Which is true. From the calendar of the Patent Rolls now deposited in the Rolls Chapel, it appears (p. 160.) that on the 4th of March 1485–6 various lordships and manors were granted to her for life *in part recompence of her dowry*, and that on the following day other lordships and manors, of which the enumeration occupies forty-six lines, together with certain "yearly payments," amounting altogether to 655*l.* 7*s.* 6½*d.*, were in like manner granted to her for life *in recompence of the residue of her dowry.*

Dr. Lingard does not indeed allege any grounds for thinking that this compensation was not now withdrawn; which would justify Polydore's statement in substance. But he does allege good reasons for thinking that Polydore's account of the severity exercised towards the Queen Dowager for the rest of her days is exaggerated; the principal evidence to the contrary being the project of a marriage between her and James III. of Scotland, which was certainly entertained in the following year. See Rymer, xii. 329. It is also certain that on the 19th of February 1490, an annuity of 400*l.* was granted to her (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 5 Hen. VII. p. 38.). But this *may* have been in consideration of the withdrawal of the former grant,—if it was withdrawn.

Bacon does not seem to have had any original information on this matter. He merely repeats the original story as he found it; and we can only infer from his adoption of it that he had seen no reason for doubting its accuracy. It is certainly not true that the Queen Dowager was entirely secluded from court for the remainder of her life; for she was with her

pretences, — that she had delivered her two daughters out of sanctuary to King Richard, contrary to promise. Which proceeding being even at that time taxed for rigorous and undue, both in matter and manner, makes it very probable there was some greater matter against her, which the King upon reason of policy and to avoid envy would not publish. It is likewise no small argument that there was some secret in it and some suppressing of examinations, for that the priest Simon himself after he was taken was never brought to execution; no not so much as to public trial (as many clergymen were upon less treasons); but was only shut up close in a dungeon. Add to this that after the Earl of Lincoln (a principal person of the house of York) was slain in Stoke-field, the King opened himself to some of his counsel, that he was sorry for the Earl's death, because by him (he said) he might have known the bottom of his danger.

But to return to the narration itself: Simon did first instruct his scholar for the part of Richard Duke of York, second son to King Edward the Fourth; and this was at such time as it was voiced that the King purposed to put to death Edward Plantagenet prisoner in the Tower, whereat there was great murmur. But hearing soon after a general bruit that Plantagenet had escaped out of the Tower,[1] and thereby finding him

daughter in November 1489 (Lel. iv. p. 249). It probably is true that she was not much at court, but lived in retirement; for which there may have been many reasons. She was growing old; the King's mother was generally with the Queen; and it often happens that the mother and the mother-in-law can live more comfortably at a little distance from each other. The King may have been obliged to choose which of the two he would have in his house, — his own mother or his wife's.

[1] Polydore says, *in carcere interiisse.* In this Bacon seems to have followed Hall, who says the rumour was that he had *broken out of prison.*

so much beloved amongst the people, and such rejoicing at his escape, the cunning priest changed his copy, and chose now Plantagenet to be the subject his pupil should personate, because he was more in the present speech and votes of the people; and it pieced better, and followed more close and handsomely upon the bruit of Plantagenet's escape. But yet doubting that there would be too near looking and too much perspective into his disguise,[1] if he should shew it here in England; he thought good (after the manner of scenes in stage-plays and masks) to shew it afar off; and therefore sailed with his scholar into Ireland, where the affection to the house of York was most in height. The King had been a little improvident in the matters of Ireland, and had not removed officers and counsellors, and put in their places, or at least intermingled, persons of whom he stood assured; as he should have done, since he knew the strong bent of that country towards the house of York, and that it was a ticklish and unsettled state, more easy to receive distempers and mutations than England was. But trusting to the reputation of his victories and successes in England, he thought he should have time enough to extend his cares afterwards to that second kingdom.

Wherefore through this neglect, upon the coming of Simon with his pretended Plantagenet into Ireland, all things were prepared for revolt and sedition, almost as if they had been set and plotted beforehand. Simon's first address was to the Lord Thomas Fitz-Gerard, Earl of Kildare and Deputy of Ireland; before whose eyes he did cast such a mist (by his own insinuation,

[1] *Minus sibi tutum futurum, et hominum curiositati et inquisitioni magis obnoxium.*

and by the carriage of his youth, that expressed a natural princely behaviour) as, joined perhaps with some inward vapours of ambition and affection in the Earl's own mind, left him fully possessed that it was the true Plantagenet. The Earl presently communicated the matter with some of the nobles and others there, at the first secretly. But finding them of like affection to himself, he suffered it of purpose to vent and pass abroad; because they thought it not safe to resolve, till they had a taste of the people's inclination. But if the great ones were in forwardness, the people were in fury, entertaining this airy body or phantasm with incredible affection; partly out of their great devotion to the house of York, partly out of a proud humour in the nation to give a King to the realm of England. Neither did the party in this heat of affection much trouble themselves with the attainder of George Duke of Clarence; having newly learned by the King's example that attainders do not interrupt the conveying of title to the crown. And as for the daughters of King Edward the Fourth, they thought King Richard had said enough for them;[1] and took them to be but as of the King's party, because they were in his power and at his disposing. So that with marvellous consent and applause, this counterfeit Plantagenet was brought with great solemnity to the castle of Dublin, and there saluted, served, and honoured as King; the boy becoming it well, and doing nothing that did bewray the baseness of his condition. And within a few days after he was proclaimed King in

[1] *i. e.* the example of Richard had shown that their claim was no insuperable impediment. The Latin is fuller—*facile innitebantur repulsæ quam a Rege Richardo hæreditate regni summotæ, tulissent.*

Dublin, by the name of King Edward the Sixth; there being not a sword drawn in King Henry his quarrel.

The King was much moved with this unexpected accident, when it came to his ears, both because it struck upon that string which ever he most feared,[1] as also because it was stirred in such a place, where he could not with safety transfer his own person to suppress it. For partly through natural valour and partly through an universal suspicion (not knowing whom to trust) he was ever ready to wait upon all his achievements in person. The King therefore first called his counsel together at the Charter-house at Shine;[2] which counsel was held with great secrecy, but the open decrees thereof, which presently came abroad, were three.

The first was, that the Queen Dowager, for that she, contrary to her pact and agreement with those that had concluded with her concerning the marriage of her daughter Elizabeth with King Henry, had nevertheless delivered her daughters out of sanctuary into King Richard's hands, should be cloistered in the nunnery of Bermondsey,[3] and forfeit all her lands and goods.

[1] *i. e.* the revival of the York title. *Tituli scilicet Eboracensis familiæ resuscitationem.*

[2] This was soon after Candlemas, 1486-7. See the Herald's narrative, Cott. MSS., Jul. B. xii. fo. 23.; or Leland, IV. p. 208.

[3] This fact is stated by Speed, on the authority probably of Hall; who says that she "lived ever after in the Abbey of Bermondsey at Southwark, a wretched and miserable life, where not long after she deceased." The statement as to her residing there for the rest of her life is confirmed by the fact that her will, which is dated 10th April, 1492, was witnessed by the Abbot of Bermondsey; and it seems that she had a right, under the will of the founder, to accommodation in the state apartments there. If there be any ground for supposing that Henry compelled her to reside

The next was, that Edward Plantagenet, then close prisoner in the Tower, should be, in the most public and notorious manner that could be devised, shewed unto the people: in part to discharge the King of the envy of that opinion and bruit, how he had been put to death privily in the Tower; but chiefly to make the people see the levity and imposture of the proceedings of Ireland, and that their Plantagenet was indeed but a puppet or a counterfeit.

The third was, that there should be again proclaimed a general pardon to all that would reveal their offences[1] and submit themselves by a day; and that this pardon should be conceived in so ample and liberal a manner, as no high-treason (no not against the King's own person) should be excepted. Which though it might seem strange, yet was it not so to a wise King, that knew his greatest dangers were not from the least treasons, but from the greatest. These resolutions of the King and his counsel were immediately put in execution. And first, the Queen Dowager was put into the monastery of Bermondsey, and all her estate seized into the King's hands: whereat there was much wondering; that a weak woman, for the yielding to the menaces and promises of a tyrant, after such a distance of time (wherein the King had shown no displeasure nor alteration), but much more after so happy a marriage between the King and her daughter, blessed with issue male, should upon a

there against her will, it may be imputed perhaps to his natural aversion to see a good thing thrown away. Her pension may possibly have been given upon condition that she should not pay for lodgings when she might have them for nothing. See note p. 73.

[1] This condition is not mentioned by the earlier historians. Polydore says, *Qui in officio deinceps permanserint.*

sudden mutability or disclosure of the King's mind be so severely handled.

This lady was amongst the examples of great variety of fortune. She had first, from a distressed suitor and desolate widow, been taken to the marriage bed of a bachelor-King, the goodliest personage of his time; and even in his reign she had endured a strange eclipse, by the King's flight and temporary depriving from the crown. She was also very happy in that she had by him fair issue, and continued his nuptial love (helping herself by some obsequious bearing and dissembling of his pleasures) to the very end. She was much affectionate to her own kindred, even unto faction; which did stir great envy in the lords of the King's side, who counted her blood a disparagement to be mingled with the King's. With which lords of the King's blood joined also the King's favourite the Lord Hastings; who, notwithstanding the King's great affection to him, was thought at times, through her malice and spleen, not to be out of danger of falling. After her husband's death she was matter of tragedy, having lived to see her brother beheaded, and her two sons deposed from the crown, bastarded in their blood, and cruelly murdered. All this while nevertheless she enjoyed her liberty, state, and fortunes.[1] But after-

[1] This can hardly be correct. For her marriage having been declared by act of Parliament invalid and her children illegitimate, her inheritance (unless expressly reserved to her by the act, which seems unlikely) must have been taken away. It is true however that on the 1st of March, 1483–4, about eight months after Richard's accession, he bound himself to befriend and provide for her daughters as his kinswomen, and to allow her 700 marks (466*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*) a year for life, if they would come out of sanctuary. On the accession of Henry she was restored to her rank and style, and the act by which her marriage had been declared illegitimate was reversed without being read, "that the matter might be and remain

him): but the King having tasted of the envy of the people for his imprisonment of Edward Plantagenet, was doubtful to heap up any more distastes of that kind by the imprisonment of De la Pole also; the rather thinking it policy to conserve him as a corrival unto the other. The Earl of Lincoln was induced to participate with the action of Ireland, not lightly upon the strength of the proceedings there, which was but a bubble; but upon letters from the Lady Margaret of Burgundy, in whose succours and declaration for the enterprise there seemed to be a more solid foundation, both for reputation and forces. Neither did the Earl refrain the business for that he knew the pretended Plantagenet to be but an idol. But contrariwise he was more glad it should be the false Plantagenet than the true; because the false being sure to fall away of himself, and the true to be made sure of by the King, it might open and pave a fair and prepared way to his own title. With this resolution he sailed secretly into Flanders,[1] where was a little before arrived the Lord Lovell, leaving a correspondence here in England with Sir Thomas Broughton,[2] a man of great power and dependencies in Lancashire. For before this time,[3] when the pretended Plantagenet was first received in

[1] This must have been a little after Candlemas. "And after Candellmasse the King at Shene had a great counsell of his lords both spũelx and templx . . . and at that counseill was the Erle of Lincoln, which incontinently after the said counseil departed the lande and went into Flaunders," &c. (Cott. MSS., *ubi supra.*)

[2] *Qui consiliorum suorum veluti procuratorem in Angliâ reliquerat Thomam B. &c.*

[3] The translation adds — (*ut supra diximus*), referring to the messengers mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph. In the MS. the words "(as we said before)" inserted after "Lady Margaret," have a line drawn through them.

Ireland, secret messengers had been also sent to the Lady Margaret, advertising her what had passed in Ireland, imploring succours in an enterprise (as they said) so pious and just, and that God had so miraculously prospered in the beginning thereof; and making offer that all things should be guided by her will and direction, as the sovereign patroness and protectress of the enterprise. Margaret was second sister to King Edward the Fourth, and had been second wife to Charles surnamed the Hardy, Duke of Burgundy. By whom having no children of her own, she did with singular care and tenderness intend the education of Philip and Margaret, grandchildren to her former husband;[1] which won her great love and authority among the Dutch. This Princess (having the spirit of a man and malice of a woman) abounding in treasure by the greatness of her dower and her provident government, and being childless and without any nearer care, made it her design and enterprise to see the Majesty Royal of England once again replaced in her house; and had set up King Henry as a mark at whose overthrow all her actions should aim and shoot; insomuch as all the counsels of his succeeding troubles came chiefly out of that quiver. And she bare such a mortal hatred to the house of Lancaster and personally to the King, as she was no ways mollified by the conjunction of the houses in her niece's marriage; but rather hated her niece, as the means of the King's ascent to the crown and assurance therein. Where-

[1] An incorrect expression; which is retained in the translation. He meant to say *grandchildren to her husband by his former wife.* They were the children of Maria, Charles's only child by his first marriage. See Polydore Vergil, p. 724.

fore with great violence of affection she embraced this overture. And upon counsel taken with the Earl of Lincoln and the Lord Lovell, and some other of the party, it was resolved with all speed, the two lords assisted with a regiment of two thousand Almains, being choice and veteran bands, under the command of Martin Swart (a valiant and experimented captain) should pass over into Ireland to the new King; hoping that when the action should have the face of a received and settled regality (with such a second person as the Earl of Lincoln, and the conjunction and reputation of foreign succours), the fame of it would embolden and prepare all the party of the confederates and malcontents within the realm of England to give them assistance when they should come over there. And for the person of the counterfeit, it was agreed that if all things succeeded well he should be put down, and the true Plantagenet received; wherein nevertheless the Earl of Lincoln had his particular hopes. After they were come into Ireland,[1] (and that the party took courage by seeing themselves together in a body,) they grew very confident of success; conceiving and discoursing amongst themselves, that they went in upon far better cards[2] to overthrow King Henry, than King Henry had to overthrow King Richard: and that if there were not a sword drawn against them in Ireland, it was a sign the swords in England would be soon sheathed or beaten down.

And first, for a bravery upon this accession of power,

[1] In the beginning of Lent, according to the Herald (Cott. MSS. *ubi sup.*) which would be in the beginning of March. Ash Wednesday fell that year on the 28th of February.

[2] *Copiis multo majoribus instructos.*

they crowned their new King in the cathedral church of Dublin, who formerly had been but proclaimed only; and then sat in counsel what should further be done. At which counsel though it were propounded by some that it were the best way to establish themselves first in Ireland, and to make that the seat of the war, and to draw King Henry thither in person, by whose absence they thought there would be great alterations and commotions in England; yet because the kingdom there was poor, and they should not be able to keep their army together, nor pay their German soldiers; and for that also the sway of the Irishmen and generally of the men of war, which (as in such cases of popular tumults is usual) did in effect govern their leaders, was eager and in affection to make their fortunes upon England; it was concluded with all possible speed to transport their forces into England.[1] The King in the mean time, who at the first when he heard what was done in Ireland, though it troubled him, yet thought he should be well enough able to scatter the Irish as a flight of birds, and rattle away this swarm of bees with their King; when he heard afterwards that the Earl of Lincoln was embarked in the action, and that the Lady Margaret was declared for it, he apprehended the danger in a true degree as it was; and saw plainly that his kingdom must again be put to the stake, and that he must fight for it. And first he did conceive, before he understood of the Earl of Lincoln's sailing into Ireland out of Flanders, that

[1] On the 4th of March, 1486–7, a commission was issued to Thomas Brandon to take command of "the armed force about to proceed to sea against the king's enemies there cruising." Cal. Pat. Rolls. 2 Hen. VII.

he should be assailed both upon the east parts of the kingdom of England by some impression from Flanders,[1] and upon the north-west out of Ireland: and therefore having ordered musters to be made in both parts, and having provisionally designed two generals, Jasper Earl of Bedford, and John Earl of Oxford (meaning himself also to go in person where the affairs should most require it), and nevertheless not expecting any actual invasion at that time (the winter being far on[2]), he took his journey himself towards Suffolk and Norfolk, for the confirming of those parts. And being come to St. Edmond's-bury, he understood that Thomas Marquis of Dorset (who had been one of the pledges in France) was hasting towards him to purge himself of some accusations which had been made against him. But the King though he kept an ear for him, yet was the time so doubtful, that he sent the Earl of Oxford to meet him and forthwith to carry him to the Tower, with a fair message nevertheless that he should bear that disgrace with patience; for that the King meant not his hurt, but only to preserve him from doing hurt either to the King's service or to himself; and that the King should always be able (when he had cleared himself) to make him reparation.

From St. Edmond's-bury he went to Norwich, where he kept his Christmas.[3] And from thence he went

[1] *Factâ invasione a copiis e Flandriâ.*

[2] Bacon in all this narrative follows Polydore Vergil; who mistook the time of the year; thinking that all this took place before Christmas. It appears from the Herald's narrative (which may be considered a conclusive authority on such a point) that the King began his journey towards Suffolk in "the second week in Lent:" which was the second week in March. (Cott. MS. *ubi sup.*)

[3] So Polydore: a mistake. It was Easter, not Christmas, that he kept at Norwich. (Cott. MSS. *ubi sup.*) Bacon seems to have felt the difficulty

(in a manner of pilgrimage) to Walsingham, where he visited our Lady's church, famous for miracles, and made his prayers and vows for his help and deliverance. And from thence he returned by Cambridge to London.[1] Not long after, the rebels with their King (under the leading of the Earl of Lincoln, the Earl of Kildare, the Lord Lovell, and Colonel Swart) landed at Fouldrey in Lancashire, whither there repaired to them Sir Thomas Broughton, with some small company of English. The King by that time (knowing now the storm would not divide but fall in one place) had levied forces in good number; and in person (taking with him his two designed generals, the Duke of Bedford and the Earl of Oxford) was come on his way towards them as far as Coventry, whence he sent forth a troop of light-horsemen for discovery, and to inter-

of this date, though he had no authority for correcting it: for in the Latin translation the words are omitted. Easter day fell that year on the 15th of April. The King had kept his Christmas at Greenwich.

[1] So again Polydore: a mistake; induced probably by the previous one. From Norwich Henry went by Cambridge, Huntingdon, and Northampton to *Coventry;* where he was on the 22nd of April; and where he remained until he heard of the landing of the rebels in Lancashire.

Polydore's mistake of Christmas for Easter is unlucky. It spoils the story of the King's movements. The truth, I suppose, is that at first he thought the danger was most imminent from Flanders, and then he kept near his east coast and went to Norwich; but finding that it did not gather on that side but drew towards Ireland, he proceeded straight towards the west, and took up his position at Coventry, at an equal distance from either coast: and there waited till he should hear at what point he was to be attacked. It was not till the 5th of May that the principal party of the rebels landed in Ireland. (See the King's letter to E. of Ormond, 13th May, Ellis, l. i. 18.) Upon news of which (according to the Herald, *ubi sup.* p. 24.) he licensed divers of his nobles to go to their countries and prepare to return with forces upon a day assigned; and himself rode over to Kenilworth, where the Queen and his mother were; and there he heard of the landing of the rebels in Lancashire; which was (see Rot. Parl. p. 397.) on the 4th of June.

cept some stragglers of the enemies, by whom he might the better understand the particulars of their progress and purposes; which was accordingly done; though the King otherways was not without intelligence from espials in the camp.

The rebels took their way towards York without spoiling the country or any act of hostility, the better to put themselves into favour of the people and to personate their King (who no doubt out of a princely feeling was sparing and compassionate towards his subjects). But their snow-ball did not gather as it went. For the people came not in to them; neither did any rise or declare themselves in other parts of the kingdom for them; which was caused partly by the good taste that the King had given his people of his government, joined with the reputation of his felicity; and partly for that it was an odious thing to the people of England to have a King brought in to them upon the shoulders of Irish and Dutch, of which their army was in substance compounded. Neither was it a thing done with any great judgment on the party of the rebels, for them to take their way towards York; considering that howsoever those parts had formerly been a nursery of their friends, yet it was there where the Lord Lovell had so lately disbanded; and where the King's presence had a little before qualified discontents. The Earl of Lincoln, deceived of his hopes of the country's[1] concourse unto him (in which case he would have temporised) and seeing the business past retreat,[2]

[1] *Populum enim ad se certatim confluxurum sibi promiserat.* The MS. and Ed. 1622 also have "countries;" meaning I think "of the countrie," not "of the countries."

[2] "Retraict" in the MS.: *sine receptu* in the translation.

resolved to make on where the King was, and to give him battle; and thereupon marched towards Newark, thinking to have surprised the town. But the King was somewhat before this time come to Nottingham, where he called a counsel of war, at which was consulted whether it were best to protract time or speedily to set upon the rebels. In which counsel the King himself (whose continual vigilance did suck in sometimes causeless suspicions which few else knew) inclined to the accelerating a battle.[1] But this was presently put out of doubt, by the great aids that came in to him in the instant of this consultation, partly upon missives and partly voluntaries, from many parts of the kingdom.

The principal persons that came then to the King's aid were the Earl of Shrewsbury and the Lord Strange, of the nobility, and of knights and gentlemen to the number of at least threescore and ten persons, with their companies; making in the whole at the least six thousand fighting men, besides the forces that were with the King before. Whereupon the King finding his army so bravely reinforced, and a great alacrity in all his men to fight, he[2] was confirmed in his former

[1] This is not stated by Polydore; and I do not know where it comes from. But the Herald's narrative supplies an anecdote illustrative of Henry's proneness to "suspicions which few else knew," which is worth inserting. "And on the morrow, which was Corpus Christi day, after the King had heard the divine service in the parish church, and the trumpets had blown to horse, the King, *not letting his host to understand his intent*, rode backward to see and also welcome the Lord Strange, which brought with him a great host, ... which unknown turning to the host caused many folks for to marvel. Also the King's standard and much carriage followed after the King, unto the time the King was advertised by Garter King of Arms, whom the King commanded to turn them all again," &c. Cott. MS. *ubi sup.* p. 26.

[2] The edition of 1622 omits "he."

resolution, and marched speedily, so as he put himself between the enemies' camp and Newark; being loth their army should get the commodity of that town. The Earl, nothing dismayed, came forwards that day unto a little village called Stoke, and there encamped that night, upon the brow or hanging of a hill. The King the next day[1] presented him battle upon the plain (the fields there being open and champion). The Earl courageously came down and joined battle with him. Concerning which battle the relations that are left unto us are so naked and negligent (though it be an action of so recent memory) as they rather declare the success of the day than the manner of the fight. They say that the King divided his army into three battails, whereof the vant-guard only well strengthened with wings came to fight:[2] that the fight was fierce and obstinate, and lasted three hours before the victory inclined either way; save that judgment might be made by that the King's vant-guard of itself maintained fight against the whole power of the enemies (the other two battails remaining out of action) what the success was like to be in the end: that Martin Swart with his Germans performed bravely, and so did those few English that were on that side; neither did the Irish fail in courage or fierceness, but being almost naked men, only armed with darts and skeins,[3] it was rather an execution than a fight upon them; insomuch as the furious slaughter of them was a great discouragement and appalment to the rest: that there died upon the place all the chieftains; that is, the Earl

[1] Saturday, June 16, 1487.
[2] The translation adds *totumque exercitus hostilis impetum sustinuerat.*
[3] *Ensibus.*

of Lincoln, the Earl of Kildare, Francis Lord Lovell, Martin Swart, and Sir Thomas Broughton, all making good the fight without any ground given. Only of the Lord Lovell there went a report, that he fled, and swam over Trent on horseback, but could not recover the further side, by reason of the steepness of the bank, and so was drowned in the river. But another report leaves him not there, but that he lived long after in a cave or vault.[1] The number that was slain in the field, was of the enemies' part four thousand at the least, and of the King's part one half of his vant-guard, besides many hurt, but none of name. There were taken prisoners amongst others the counterfeit Plantagenet, now Lambert Symnell again, and the crafty priest his tutor. For Lambert, the King would not take his life, both out of magnanimity (taking him but as an image of wax that others had tempered and moulded), and likewise out of wisdom; thinking that if he suffered death he would be forgotten too soon; but being kept alive he would be a continual spectacle, and a kind of remedy against the like inchantments of people in time to come. For which cause he was taken into service in his court to a base office in his kitchen; so that (in a kind of *mattacina*[2] of human fortune) he turned a broach that had worn a crown; whereas fortune commonly doth not bring in a comedy

[1] "Towards the close of the 17th century (says Dr. Lingard) at his seat at Minster Lovell in Oxfordshire, was accidentally discovered a chamber under the ground, in which was the skeleton of a man seated in a chair with his head reclined on a table."

[2] *Insigni humanæ fortunæ ludibrio. Mattacini*, according to Florio, was "a kind of moresco or mattachino dance." He does not give the word *mattacina*. But I take it that *mattacini* were properly the dancers of this dance, and that *mattacina* was a dance of *mattacini*, just as *attelana* was a play of *attelani*.

or farce after a tragedy. And afterwards he was preferred to be one of the King's falconers. As to the priest, he was committed close prisoner, and heard of no more; the King loving to seal up his own dangers.

After the battle the King went to Lincoln, where he caused supplications and thanksgivings to be made for his deliverance and victory. And that his devotions might go round in circle, he sent his banner to be offered to our Lady of Walsingham, where before he made his vows.

And thus delivered of this so strange an engine and new invention of fortune,[1] he returned to his former confidence of mind, thinking now that all his misfortunes had come at once. But it fell unto him[2] according to the speech of the common people in the beginning of his reign, that said, *It was a token he should reign in labour, because his reign began with a sickness of sweat.* But howsoever the King thought himself now in the haven,[3] yet such was his wisdom, as his confidence did seldom darken his foresight, especially in things near-hand; and therefore, awakened by so fresh and unexpected dangers, he entered into due consideration as well how to weed out the partakers of the former rebellion, as to kill the seeds of the like in time to come: and withal to take away all shelters and harbours for discontented persons, where they might hatch and foster rebellions which afterwards might gather strength and motion.

And first he did yet again make a progress from

[1] *Tam insigni fortunæ machina (quæ in eum intentata fuerat).*
[2] So the MS. The edition of 1622 has "fell out."
[3] Ed. 1622 has "*a* haven."

Lincoln to the northern parts, though it were (indeed) rather an itinerary circuit of justice than a progress. For all along as he went, with much severity and strict inquisition, partly by martial law and partly by commission,[1] were punished the adherents and aiders of the late rebels; not all by death (for the field had drawn much blood), but by fines and ransoms, which spared life and raised treasure. Amongst other crimes of this nature, there was a diligent inquiry made of such as had raised and dispersed a bruit and rumour (a little before the field fought) that the rebels had the day, and that the King's army was overthrown, and the King fled: whereby it was supposed that many succours which otherwise would have come unto the King were cunningly put off and kept back: which charge and accusation, though it had some ground, yet it was industriously embraced and put on by divers, who (having been in themselves not the best affected to the King's part, nor forward to come to his aid) were glad to apprehend this colour to cover their neglect and coldness under the pretence of such discouragements. Which cunning nevertheless the King would not understand, though he lodged it and noted it in some particulars, as his manner was.

But for the extirpating of the roots and causes of the like commotions in time to come, the King began to find where his shoe did wring him; and that it was his depressing of the house of York that did rankle and fester the affections of his people. And therefore being now too wise to disdain perils any longer,[2] and

[1] *Partim viâ justitiæ ordinariâ.*

[2] *Factus igitur jam cautior, neque pericula amplius contemnere, aut remedia eorum dedignatione quâdam rejicere volens.*

willing to give some contentment in that kind (at least in ceremony), he resolved at last[1] to proceed to the coronation of his Queen. And therefore at his coming to London, where he entered in state, and in a kind of triumph, and celebrated his victory with two days of devotion, (for the first day he repaired to Paul's, and had the hymn of *Te Deum* sung, and the morrow after he went in procession, and heard the sermon at the Cross,) the Queen was with great solemnity crowned at Westminster, the twenty-fifth of November,[2] in the third year of his reign, which was about two years after the marriage (like an old christening that had stayed long for godfathers); which strange and unusual distance of time made it subject to every man's note that it was an act against his stomach, and put upon him by necessity and reason of state. Soon after, to shew that it was now fair weather again, and that the imprisonment of Thomas Marquis Dorset was rather upon suspicion of the time than of the man, he the said Marquis was set at liberty, without examination or other circumstance.

At that time also the King sent an ambassador unto Pope Innocent, signifying unto him this his marriage; and that now like another Æneas he had passed

[1] We learn from the Herald's narrative (Cott. MSS. Jul. xii. fo. 28.) that the resolution was taken at Warwick in September. The King and Queen left Warwick on Saturday, October 27, and entered London on the 3rd of November.

[2] There was a Parliament sitting at the time, which Bacon does not seem to have known. We learn from the Herald (Cott. MSS., *ubi sup.* fo. 40. *b.*) that the coronation festivities were ended (27th November) sooner than they would have been, by reason of "the great business of the Parliament." This was Henry's second Parliament. It met on the 9th of the month, and voted (in consideration of the rebellion just suppressed, I suppose, as well as of the Queen's coronation) two fifteenths and tenths. Stowe knew nothing of this Parliament.

through the floods of his former troubles and travails and was arrived unto a safe haven; and thanking his Holiness that he had honoured the celebration of his marriage with the presence of his ambassador; and offering both his person and the forces of his kingdom upon all occasions to do him service.

The ambassador making his oration[1] to the Pope in the presence of the cardinals, did so magnify the King and Queen, as was enough to glut the hearers.[2] But then he did again so extol and deify the Pope, as made all that he had said in praise of his master and mistress seem temperate and passable. But he was very honourably entertained and extremely much made on by the Pope, who knowing himself to be lazy and unprofitable to the Christian world, was wonderful[3] glad to hear that there were such echoes of him sounding in remote parts. He obtained also of the Pope a very just and honourable Bull, qualifying the privileges of sanctuary (wherewith the King had been extremely galled) in three points.

The first, that if any sanctuary-man did by night or otherwise get out of sanctuary privily and commit mischief and trespass, and then come in again, he should leese the benefit of sanctuary for ever after.

The second, that howsoever the person of the sanctuary-man was protected from his creditors, yet his goods out of sanctuary should not.

The third, that if any took sanctuary for case of

[1] The heads of this oration may still be seen among the Cotton MSS. in the British Museum (Cleop. E. iii. f. 123.); and read by any one who thinks it worth while to decipher them.

[2] *Ut fastidio eos qui aderant prope enecaret.*

[3] "Wonderfully." Ed. 1622.

treason, the King might appoint him keepers to look to him in sanctuary.[1]

The King also, for the better securing of his estate against mutinous and malcontented subjects (whereof he saw the realm was full) who might have their refuge into Scotland (which was not under key as the ports were), for that cause rather than for any doubt of hostility from those parts, before his coming to London, when he was at Newcastle, had sent a solemn ambassage unto James the Third, King of Scotland, to treat and conclude a peace with him. The ambassadors were, Richard Foxe Bishop of Exeter, and Sir Richard Edgcombe comptroller of the King's house, who were honourably received and entertained there. But the King of Scotland labouring of the same disease that King Henry did (though more mortal as afterwards appeared), that is, discontented subjects apt to rise and raise tumult, although in his own affection he did much desire to make a peace with the King, yet finding his nobles averse and not daring to displease them, concluded only a truce for seven years;[2] giv-

[1] *i. e.* keepers *within* the sanctuary. *Custodes ei intra asylum apponere qui ejus dicta et facta observarent.*

[2] This is Polydore Vergil's statement, who seems to have known nothing of the real subject of this treaty. It appears from Rymer that a truce between England and Scotland for three years, counting from the 3rd of July, 1486, had been negotiated during the King's first progress into the northern counties in the spring of that year, when he was engaged in subduing Lord Lovel's rebellion; which truce was still in force. On the 7th of November, 1487, which was a few days after the King's return to London from his second progress into those counties, commissioners were appointed *to treat of certain intermarriages between the two royal families;* it being proposed that the Scotch King should marry Elizabeth, Edward the Fourth's widow; and that the Duke of Rothsay should marry one of her daughters, and the Marquis of Ormond another. By these commissioners a treaty was shortly concluded, by which it was agreed in the first place that the existing truce should be continued to the 1st of September, 1489;

ing nevertheless promise in private, that it should be renewed from time to time during the two Kings' lives.

Hitherto the King had been exercised in settling his affairs at home. But about this time brake forth an occasion that drew him to look abroad and to hearken to foreign business. Charles the Eighth, the French King, by the virtue and good fortune of his two immediate predecessors, Charles the Seventh his grandfather and Lewis the Eleventh his father, received the kingdom of France in more flourishing and spread estate [1] than it had been of many years before; being redintegrate in those principal members which anciently had been portions of the crown of France, and were after dissevered, so as they remained only in homage and not in sovereignty, being governed by absolute princes [2] of their own; Anjou, Normandy, Provence, and Burgundy. There remained only Brittaine [3] to be re-united, and so the monarchy of France to be reduced to the ancient terms and bounds.

and in the next place, that, in order to settle the articles and conditions of these marriages, commissioners on both sides should meet at Edinburgh on the 24th of the following January, and another assembly be held on the same subject in May. So much was concluded on the 28th of November, 1487. The negotiation was afterwards broken off (according to Tytler, who quotes *Rotul. Scot.* vol. ii. p. 483.) upon the question of the surrender of Berwick; upon which James insisted, and to which Henry would not consent. See *Tytler's Hist. of Scot.* vol. iv. p. 305.

[1] *Opibus florentius et ipso territorio amplius.*

[2] This is explained (or corrected) in the Latin translation to mean princes governing in their own right: *cum a principibus propriis jure tanquam regio administrarentur.*

[3] I have retained the spelling of the MS. In the edition of 1622 it is spelt Britaine. In modern histories it is always spelt either Bretagne or Brittany.

King Charles was not a little inflamed with an ambition to re-purchase and re-annex that duchy; which his ambition was a wise and well-weighed ambition; not like unto the ambitions of his succeeding enterprises of Italy.[1] For at that time, being newly come to the crown, he was somewhat guided by his father's counsels; (counsels not counsellors, for his father was his own counsel, and had few able men about him;) and that King (he knew well) had ever distasted the designs of Italy, and in particular had an eye upon Brittaine. There were many circumstances that did feed the ambition of Charles with pregnant and apparent hopes of success. The Duke of Brittaine old, and entered into a lethargy, and served with mercenary counsellors, father of two only daughters, the one sickly and not like to continue. King Charles himself in the flower of his age,[2] and the subjects of France at that time[3] well trained for war, both for leaders and soldiers (men of service being not yet worn out since the wars of Lewis against Burgundy). He found himself also in peace with all his neighbour princes. As for those that might oppose to his enterprise; Maximilian King of Romans, his rival in the same desires (as well for the duchy as the daughter), feeble in means; and King Henry of England as well

[1] The difference is perhaps best explained by supposing that the latter ambitions were his own, while these were his sister's, the princess Anne, Duchess of Bourbon; under whose guardianship Charles, who was only fourteen when he came to the throne in 1483, had been placed by his father; and by whom modern historians suppose him to have been entirely guided during all the early stages of this business.

[2] Rather in the blossom than the flower. In the summer of 1487 he was still only eighteen.

[3] *Pro ratione ejus temporis* in the translation: which would mean "*for* that time."

somewhat obnoxious[1] to him for his favours and benefits, as busied in his particular troubles at home. There was also a fair and specious occasion offered him to hide his ambition and to justify his warring upon Brittaine;[2] for that the Duke had received and succoured Lewis Duke of Orleans and others of the French nobility, which had taken arms against their King. Wherefore King Charles, being resolved upon that war, knew well he could not receive any opposition so potent as if King Henry should either upon policy of state in preventing the growing greatness of France, or upon gratitude unto the Duke of Brittaine for his former favours in the time of his distress,[3] espouse that quarrel and declare himself in aid of the Duke.[4] Therefore he no sooner heard that King Henry was settled by his victory, but forthwith he sent ambassadors unto him to pray his assistance, or at least that he would stand neutral. Which ambassadors found the King at Leicester,[5] and delivered their ambassage to this effect: They first imparted unto the King the success that their master had had a little before against Maximilian in recovery of certain

[1] *Sibi non nihil devinctum.* For this word "obnoxious," now no longer used in this sense, though always so used by Bacon, it is not easy to find an exact equivalent. It means rather more than "obliged," and not quite so much as "dependent." When one man stands in such a relation to another that he is not free to act as he otherwise would, Bacon would have said that he is obnoxious to him.

[2] *Belli ansam adversus Britanniam porrigeret.*

[3] *Quod ipse Duci etiam Britanniæ non minus quam sibi ob ejus in rebus suis adversis merita obstrictus fuisset.*

[4] The last clause is omitted in the translation.

[5] In the summer of 1487; probably in September; certainly not later, for the King was at Warwick in September. See note 1, p. 94. The Latin translation has *Lancastriam*, probably a mistake. Polydore Vergil, whose narrative is followed by all the old historians, has *ad Lecestriam.*

towns from him;[1] which was done in a kind of privacy and inwardness towards the King; as if the French King did not esteem him for an outward or formal confederate, but as one that had part in his affections and fortunes, and with whom he took pleasure to communicate his business. After this compliment and some gratulation for the King's victory, they fell to their errand: declaring to the King, that their master was enforced to enter into a just and necessary war with the Duke of Brittaine, for that he had received and succoured those that were traitors and declared enemies unto his person and state: That they were no mean distressed and calamitous persons that fled to him for refuge, but of so great quality, as it was apparent that they came not thither to protect their own fortune, but to infest and invade his; the head of them being the Duke of Orleans, the first Prince of the blood and the second person of France: That therefore rightly to understand it, it was rather on their master's part a defensive war than an offensive, as that that could not be omitted or forborne if he tendered the conservation of his own estate; and that it was not the first blow that made the war invasive (for that no wise Prince would stay for), but the first provocation, or at least the first preparation; nay that this war was rather a suppression of rebels than a war with a just enemy; where the case is, that his subjects traitors[2] are received by the Duke of Brittaine his

[1] *In oppidis quibusdam quæ invaserat Maximilianus recipiendis.* He had retaken St. Omers on the 27th of May, and Therouane on the 26th of July. (*Sism.* xv. p. 99.)

[2] In the edition of 1622 these words are printed thus: "his subjects, traitors, are received," &c. In the MS. there is no comma before or after traitors. And this I believe expresses the intended construction better.

homager: That King Henry knew well what went upon it in example, if neighbour Princes should patronise and comfort rebels against the law of nations and of leagues: Nevertheless that their master was not ignorant that the King had been beholding to the Duke of Brittaine in his adversity, as on the other side they knew he would not forget also the readiness of their King in aiding him when the Duke of Brittaine or his mercenary counsellors failed him, and would have betrayed him; and that there was a great difference between the courtesies received from their master and the Duke of Brittaine, for that the Duke's might have ends of utility and bargain, whereas their master's could not have proceeded but out of entire affection; for that if it had been measured by a politic line, it had been better for his affairs that a tyrant should have reigned in England, troubled and hated, than such a Prince whose virtues could not fail to make him great and potent, whensoever he was comen to be master of his affairs: But howsoever it stood for the point of obligation which the King might owe to the Duke of Brittaine, yet their master was well

It is the same form which we have further on (pp. 134–145), *merchants strangers;* for so it is written in the MS.; the double plural, without any comma between. So it was usual in Bacon's time to say "letters patents;" not "letters patent." In the edition of 1622 "merchants strangers" is printed "merchant-strangers." According to which rule "subjects traitors" would be corrected into "subject-traitors." But I rather think that the true modern equivalents would be "stranger-merchants," and "traitor-subjects."

The anomaly may have arisen either out of the practice (then usual) of placing the adjective after its substantive, (when, in the case of words that might be used either as adjectives or substantives, the plural without the final *s* would sometimes sound odd); or simply from the preservation occasionally of the French form of a phrase with which the ear had become familiar in French.

assured it would not divert King Henry of England from doing that that was just, nor ever embark him in so ill-grounded a quarrel: Therefore since this war which their master was now to make was but to deliver himself from imminent dangers, their King hoped the King would shew the like affection to the conservation of their master's estate, as their master had (when time was) shewed to the King's acquisition of his kingdom: At the least that according to the inclination which the King had ever professed of peace, he would look on and stand neutral; for that their master could not with reason press him to undertake part in the war, being so newly settled and recovered from intestine seditions. But touching the mystery of re-annexing of the duchy of Brittaine to the crown of France, either by war or by marriage with the daughter of Brittaine, the ambassadors bare aloof from it as from a rock, knowing that it made most against them; and therefore by all means declined any mention thereof, but contrariwise interlaced in their conference with the King the assured purpose of their master to match with the daughter of Maximilian; and entertained the King also with some wandering discourses[1] of their King's purpose to recover by arms

[1] This point is not mentioned by Polydore Vergil; who seems to have been the only authority with previous historians for all these transactions. And hence it would appear that Bacon had some independent source of information. The rest he might have *inferred* from Polydore's narrative: but this (unless he had some other authority) he must have *invented;* which he could have no object in doing. The thing is worth remarking; because as Bacon undoubtedly composed the *speeches* in this history on the Thucydidean principle, (*ὡς ἂν ἐδόκουν ἐμοὶ ἕκαστοι περὶ τῶν ἀεὶ παρόντων τὰ δέοντα μάλιστ' εἰπεῖν, ἐχομένῳ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων,*) it might be suspected that he framed his narrative upon the same principle; and if he had nothing besides Polydore and the old chroniclers (who do little more than translate Polydore)

his right to the kingdom of Naples, by an expedition in person; all to remove the King from all jealousy of any design in these hither parts upon Brittaine, otherwise than for quenching of the fire which he feared might be kindled in his own estate.

The King, after advice taken with his counsel, made answer to the ambassadors. And first returned their compliment, shewing he was right glad of the French King's reception of those towns from Maximilian. Then he familiarly related some particular passages of his own adventures and victory passed. As to the business of Brittaine, the King answered in few words; that the French King and the Duke of Brittaine were the two persons to whom he was most obliged of all men; and that he should think himself very unhappy if things should go so between them, as he should not be able to acquit himself in gratitude towards them both; and that there was no means for him, as a Christian King and a common friend to them, to satisfy all obligations both to God and man, but to offer himself for a mediator of an accord and peace between them; by which course he doubted not but their King's estate and honour both, would be preserved with more safety and less envy than by a war; and that he would spare no cost or pains, no if it were

to go upon, it would appear that a good deal of it was mere invention. We know however that in other parts of the history Bacon had independent evidence, which is still extant and accessible; and there is no reason to conclude that what is extant was all he had. The fire in the Cottonian Library in 1731 may easily have destroyed the evidence of those parts of the narrative which are not accounted for, as another such fire would in all probability destroy the evidence of many which are. It is a fact that the volumes relating to the times of Henry VII. have suffered much. These remarks apply also to the passage about "*envy*," a little further on, which is not to be found in Polydore.

to go on pilgrimage, for so good an effect; and concluded that in this great affair, which he took so much to heart, he would express himself more fully[1] by an ambassage, which he would speedily dispatch unto the French King for that purpose. And in this sort the French ambassadors were dismissed: the King avoiding to understand any thing touching the re-annexing of Brittaine, as the ambassadors had avoided to mention it; save that he gave a little touch of it in the word *envy*. And so it was, that the King was neither so shallow nor so ill advertised as not to perceive the intention of the French for the investing himself of Brittaine. But first, he was utterly unwilling (howsoever he gave out) to enter into a war with France. A fame of a war he liked well, but not an achievement; for the one he thought would make him richer, and the other poorer; and he was possessed with many secret fears[2] touching his own people; which he was therefore

[1] So ed. 1622. The MS. omits "fully."

[2] He had also a special reason for delaying a war with France at this time, which is not mentioned in the histories, but may be gathered from the Calendar of Patent Rolls, 3 Hen. VII. During the spring of 1488 some danger was hanging over his own coasts, probably from Ireland. From entries in the Calendar dated the 19th and 20th of February (1487–8) we find that forces were then "about to proceed to sea in three Spanish ships in resistance of the King's enemies," under command of Sir Charles Somerset. And again on the 4th of May following we find writs for the impressment of soldiers, &c., — "an armed force being about to be sent against the King's enemies congregating on the sea," — also under command of Sir Charles Somerset. (See vol. ii. p. 130.)

Who these enemies were, the Calendar does not state; but a previous entry in the same volume (p. 105), though of later date, indicates the quarter from which danger was to be feared. On the 25th of May a writ was issued to Richard Eggecombe, Knt. the King's counsellor and comptroller of his household, empowering him "to assure to *such as come from Ireland to treat on matters concerning the sound rule of peace in that land*, a safe advent, stay, and return;" and further "to admit to the King's grace all subjects of the said land that may submit themselves," &c. And at

loth to arm, and put weapons into their hands. Yet notwithstanding, as a prudent and courageous Prince, he was not so averse from a war, but that he was resolved to choose it rather than to have Brittaine carried by France; being so great and opulent a duchy,

pp. 108, 9, we find a number of general pardons for Irishmen, bearing the same date. These proceedings indicate probably the suppression of the danger for the time. For during the rest of the summer we learn (Leland, iv. p. 243.) that the King was engaged in hunting and sporting, and in the autumn, he was free, as I shall show a little further on, to take more active measures for the succour of Brittany.

On the 1st of October following, the King's uncle, the Duke of Bedford, was made Lieutenant of Ireland for a year. (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, vol. iii. p. 14.)

I am the rather disposed to think that defence against Ireland and not succour to Brittany was the object of this voyage, because it seems to have been at this time that Lord Woodville's project of raising volunteers in aid of the Duke of Brittany (see p. 110) was countermanded. "My lord hath been with the King in Windsor," (says William Paston, writing from Hedingham, the Earl of Oxford's castle, to his brother, on the 13th of May [1488],) "at St. George's feast; and there at the same feast were both the ambassadors of Bretaigne and of Flanders, as well from the King of the Romans as from the young Duke; but I cannot shew you the certain whether we shall have with them war or peace; but I understand for certain that all such captains as went to the sea in Lent, that is to say Sir Charles Somerset, Sir Richard Hawte, and Sir William Vampage, maketh them ready to go to the sea again as shortly as they can; to what intent I cannot say. Also whereas it was said that my Lord Wodevyle and other should have gone over into Bretaigne to have aided the Duke of Bretaigne, I cannot tell of none such aid; but upon that saying there came many men to Southampton, where it was said that he should have taken shipping, to have waited upon him over; and so *when he was countermanded*, those that resorted thither to have gone over with him tarried there still, in hope that they should have been licensed to have gone over; and when they saw no likelihood that they should have license, there was 200 of them that got them into a Bretaigne ship," &c. &c. He goes on to say how these 200 arrived in Brittany, where they then were. — See *Paston Letters*, vol. v. p. 367.

D'Argentré (xiii. 41.) mentions an embassy sent by the Duke of Brittany to England in September, 1487, and adds that Henry who was then very busy (avoit lors bien des affaires) some time after sent some troops to aid him, who were at the battle of St. Aubin, — but not above 500 men; alluding no doubt to Lord Woodville's company.

and situate so opportunely to annoy England either for coast or trade.[1] But the King's hopes were, that partly by negligence, commonly imputed to the French, (especially in the court of a young King[2]); and partly by the native power of Brittaine itself, which was not small; but chiefly in respect of the great party that the Duke of Orleans had in the kingdom of France, and thereby means to stir up civil troubles to divert the French King from the enterprise of Brittaine;[3] and lastly in regard of the power of Maximilian, who was corrival to the French King in that pursuit; the enterprise would either bow to a peace or break in itself. In all which the King measured and valued things amiss, as afterwards appeared. He sent therefore forthwith to the French King, Christopher Urswick his chaplain, a person by him much trusted and employed; choosing him the rather because he was a churchman, as best sorting with an embassy of pacification; and giving him also a commission, that if the French King consented to treat, he should thence repair to the Duke of Brittaine and ripen the treaty on both parts. Urswick made declaration to the French King much to the purpose of the King's answer to the French ambassadors here, instilling also tenderly some overture of receiving to grace the Duke of Orleans, and some taste of conditions of accord. But the French King on the other side proceeded not sincerely, but with a great deal of art and dissimulation in this treaty, having for his end to gain time, and so put off the English succours,

[1] *Sive bello, sive impediendo commercium.*

[2] This parenthesis is omitted in the translation.

[3] The edition of 1622 has a full stop after Brittaine: obviously a misprint. I have followed the punctuation of the MS.; which certainly has a semicolon, though not clearly written.

under hope of peace, till he had got good footing in Brittaine by force of arms. Wherefore he answered the ambassador, that he would put himself into the King's hands, and make him arbiter of the peace; and willingly consented that the ambassadors should straightways pass into Brittaine to signify this his consent, and to know the Duke's mind likewise; well foreseeing that the Duke of Orleans, by whom the Duke of Brittaine was wholly led, taking himself to be upon terms irreconcileable with him, would admit of no treaty of peace; whereby he should in one both generally abroad veil over his ambition, and win the reputation of just and moderate proceedings; and should withal endear himself in the affections of the King of England, as one that had committed all to his will; nay and (which was yet more fine) make faith in him that although he went on with the war, yet it should be but with his sword in his hand to bend the stiffness of the other party to accept of peace; and so the King should take no umbrage of his arming and prosecution, but the treaty to be kept on foot to the very last instant, till he were master of the field. Which grounds being by the French King wisely laid, all things fell out as he expected. For when the English ambassador came to the court of Brittaine, the Duke was then scarcely perfect in his memory, and all things were directed by the Duke of Orleans; who gave audience to the chaplain Urswick, and upon his ambassage delivered made answer in somewhat high terms: That the Duke of Brittaine having been an host and a kind of parent or foster-father to the King in his tenderness of age and weakness of fortune, did look for at this time from King Henry (the renowned King of Eng-

land) rather brave troops for his succours than a vain treaty of peace. And if the King could forget the good offices of the Duke done unto him aforetime, yet he knew well he would in his wisdom consider of the future, how much it imported his own safety and reputation both in foreign parts and with his own people, not to suffer Brittaine (the old confederates of England) to be swallowed up by France, and so many good ports and strong towns upon the coast be in the command of so potent a neighbour King, and so ancient an enemy: And therefore humbly desired the King to think of this business as his own: and therewith brake off, and denied any farther conference for treaty.

Urswick returned first to the French King, and related to him what had passed. Who finding things to sort to his desire, took hold of them; and said, That the ambassador might perceive now that which he for his part partly imagined before: That considering in what hands the Duke of Brittaine was, there would be no peace but by a mixed treaty of force and persuasion: And therefore he would go on with one, and desired the King not to desist from the other: But for his own part, he did faithfully promise to be still in the King's power, to rule him in the matter of peace. This was accordingly represented unto the King by Urswick at his return, and in such a fashion as if the treaty were in no sort desperate, but rather stayed for a better hour, till the hammer had wrought and beat the party of Brittaine more pliant; whereupon there passed continually packets and despatches between the two Kings, from the one out of desire,[1] and from the other out of dissimulation, about the negotiation of

[1] *Cupide sed candide.*

peace. The French King meanwhile invaded Brittaine with great forces, and distressed the city of Nantes with a strait siege,[1] and (as one who, though he had

[1] This is Polydore Vergil's statement; who seems, as I said, to have been the original authority for these transactions; and whose narrative could not then be corrected by comparison with more authentic records. Rymer's Fœdera however and the Rolls of Parliament enable us now to detect inaccuracies of date, which show that his means of information were either imperfect or carelessly used; and the researches of modern historians into the Breton archives supply several material corrections. Bacon seems to have taken Polydore's narrative as his ground-work, to have done his best to make out the meaning of it, and then to have told it as plainly and luminously as he could. And the *meaning* of it — the ideas and designs of the parties, the ends they were aiming at, and the issues they brought out — he appears to have divined with great accuracy; insomuch that every correction of his story in its details seems to make the truth of his general interpretation more manifest. But as he was obliged to fit his narrative into Polydore's frame-work, which contains several wrong dates, the details are of course very far from accurate. In a story that hangs well together, a single false date will commonly affect the whole sequence of events; and when that false date happens to separate material points that were in fact connected or to bring together material points that were in fact separate, it may even affect the whole series of causes and effects.

Though I know how inconvenient it is for a reader to be continually called away from the story in the text to listen to a different version of it, I fear that in this case the inconvenience must be submitted to. The corrections would not be intelligible to him if the original story were not fresh in his memory; and if I were to remit them to the appendix, I should be obliged either to repeat the whole or to interrupt him by references to the body of the narrative which would be more troublesome than references from the text to foot-notes. If he wishes therefore to take a true impression of Henry's proceedings in the matter of Brittany, I must ask him to pause at the points which I shall indicate, and hear what I have to say before he goes on.

In the present instance, Bacon, following Polydore Vergil, has misdated the siege of Nantes by eight or nine months. It was commenced (see D'Argentré, xiii. 38.) on the 19th of June, 1487, — only three days after the battle of Stoke; and raised on the 6th of August following, a little before the time when Charles sent his first embassy to Henry. Which if Bacon had known, he would probably have included the fresh failure of this enterprise among Henry's reasons (see pp. 106, 112,) for thinking that Brittany was not in immediate danger from France; especially if he could have connected it with another fact, which he does not seem to

no great judgment, yet had that, that he could dissemble home[1]) the more he did urge the prosecution of the war, the more he did at the same time urge the solicitation of the peace; insomuch as during the siege of Nantes, after many letters and particular messages, the better to maintain his dissimulation and to refresh the treaty, he sent Bernard Daubigny,[2] a person of good quality, to the King, earnestly to desire him to make an end of the business howsoever. The King was no less ready to revive and quicken the treaty; and thereupon sent three commissioners, the Abbot of Abingdon, Sir Richard Tunstall, and Chaplain Urswick formerly employed, to do their utmost endeavour to manage the treaty roundly and strongly.

About this time the Lord Woodvile (uncle to the Queen) a valiant gentleman and desirous of honour, sued to the King that he might raise some power of voluntaries under-hand, and without licence or pass-

have been aware of, though it is mentioned by D'Argentré, xiii. 41., and which Henry must have known, namely, that the Duke of Brittany did at that very time (24th Sept. 1487) formally entertain Maximilian's suit for his daughter.

But though it is not true that Charles was investing Nantes while the negotiations which Bacon is here speaking of were proceeding, it is true that he was preparing a fresh invasion of Brittany. (See Daru, iii. p. 134.) The inaccuracy therefore does not in this case affect the substantial truth of the narrative.

[1] *Sed tamen qui simulationum artes in sinu patris optime didicerat.*

[2] *Bernardum Dobenensem, honestum equitem*, according to Polydore. We learn from the Herald (Lel. iv. p. 236.) that "the Lorde Dawbeney, embassator of Fraunce" was at Windsor on Twelfth Even, 1487-8: which may have been the occasion Polydore was thinking of. The embassy which he represents as sent by Henry in answer (after some delay, it seems, from the illness of one of the commissioners) was despatched on the 17th of March, 1487-8. See Rymer. This *Bernardus Dobenensis* was, I suppose, Bernard Stewart, Lord Aubigny; a gentleman of Scotch extraction; who commanded the body of French soldiers that accompanied Henry to England. See Tytler's *Hist. of Scotl.* vol. iv. p. 296.

port (wherein the King might any ways appear[1]) go to the aid of the Duke of Brittaine. The King denied his request, or at least seemed so to do, and laid strait commandment upon him that he should not stir; for that the King thought his honour would suffer therein, during a treaty to better a party. Nevertheless this lord (either being unruly, or out of conceit[2] that the King would not inwardly dislike that which he would not openly avow,) sailed secretly over into the Isle of Wight whereof he was governor, and levied a fair troop of four hundred men, and with them passed over into Brittaine, and joined himself with the Duke's forces.[3] The news whereof when it came to the French court, put divers young bloods into such a fury, as the English ambassadors were not without peril to be outraged. But the French King, both to preserve the privilege of ambassadors, and being conscious to himself that in the business of peace he himself was the greater dissembler of the two, forbad all injuries of fact or word against their persons or followers. And presently came an agent from the King to purge himself touching the Lord Woodvile's going over, using for a principal argument to demonstrate that it was without his privity, for that the troops were so small, as neither had the face of a succour by authority nor could much advance the Briton affairs. To which message although the French King gave no full credit, yet he made fair weather[4] with the King and seemed satisfied. Soon after the English ambassadors returned, having two of them been likewise with

[1] *Absque commeatu aut fide publica.*
[2] *Opinione temeraria.*
[3] Compare W. Paston's letter, 13th May, 1488; quoted in note, p. 105.
[4] *Cum serenitate quadam respondit.*

the Duke of Brittaine[1] and found things in no other terms than they were before. Upon their return they informed the King of the state of the affairs, and how far the French King was from any true meaning of peace, and therefore he was now to advise of some other course. Neither was the King himself led all this while with credulity merely, as was generally supposed. But his error was not so much facility of belief, as an ill-measuring of the forces of the other party. For (as was partly touched before) the King had cast the business thus with himself. He took it for granted in his own judgment that the war of Brittaine, in respect of the strength of the towns and of the party, could not speedily come to a period. For he conceived that the counsels of a war that was undertaken by the French King (then childless[2]) against an heir apparent of France, would be very faint and slow; and besides that it was not possible but that the state of France should be embroiled with some troubles and alterations in favour of the Duke of Orleans. He conceived likewise that Maximilian

[1] According to Lobineau, i. 783, who gives as his authority *Registre*, an embassage consisting of the three commissioners above mentioned; viz. the Abbot of Abingdon, Sir Richard Tunstall, and Chaplain Urswick, — together with Dr. Wardes, — passed from France into Brittany in June, 1488: which agrees with Sismondi's statement, that from the 1st to the 26th of June in that year hostilities were suspended in consequence of Henry's mediation. Polydore adds that the ambassadors, before they returned, renewed the truce between Henry and Charles for twelve months — (*renovatis in duodecim menses cum Carolo induciis*). They probably agreed upon the terms of the truce which was signed by Henry at Windsor on 14th July, 1488, (see Rymer) and was to continue from that day till the 17th of January, 1489-90. I do not however find any trace of the counterpart signed by Charles: and it is not improbable that it was interrupted before completion by the events which immediately followed.

[2] And unmarried. *Cœlibe et sine liberis.*

King of the Romans was a Prince warlike and potent, who he made account would give succours to the Britons roundly. So then judging it would be a work of time, he laid his plot how he might best make use of that time for his own affairs. Wherein first he thought to make his vantage upon his Parliament, knowing that they being affectionate unto the quarrel of Brittaine would give treasure largely. Which treasure as a noise of war might draw forth, so a peace succeeding might coffer up. And because he knew his people were hot upon the business, he chose rather to seem to be deceived and lulled a-sleep by the French, than to be backward in himself; considering his subjects were not so fully capable of the reasons of state which made him hold back. Wherefore to all these purposes he saw no other expedient than to set and keep on foot a continual treaty of peace, laying it down and taking it up again as the occurrence required. Besides he had in consideration the point of honour, in bearing the blessed person of a pacificator. He thought likewise to make use of the envy that the French King met with by occasion of this war of Brittaine, in strengthening himself with new alliances; as namely that of Ferdinando of Spain, with whom he had ever a consent (even in nature and customs); and likewise with Maximilian, who was particularly interested. So that in substance he promised himself[1] money, honour, friends, and peace in the end.[2] But those things were too fine to be fortunate and succeed in all parts; for that great affairs are commonly too rough and stubborn to be wrought

[1] *Satis indulgenter promiserat.*

[2] *Et in fine pacem qualem optabat.*

upon by the finer edges or points of wit. The King was likewise deceived in his two main grounds. For although he had reason to conceive that the counsel of France would be wary to put the King into a war against the heir apparent of France; yet he did not consider that Charles was not guided by any of the principal of the blood or nobility,[1] but by mean men, who would make it their master-piece of credit and favour to give venturous counsels which no great or wise man durst or would. And for Maximilian, he was thought then a greater matter than he was; his unstable and necessitous courses[2] being not then known.

After consultation with the ambassadors, who brought him no other news than he expected before (though he would not seem to know it till then), he presently summoned his Parliament,[3] and in open Par-

[1] The translation has "*a viris e concilio primariis.*" According to Comines, those who governed Charles during the first four years of his reign were "Le Duc et Duchesse de Bourbon, et un Chambellan appelé le seigneur de Graville, et autres chambelans, qui en ce temps eurent grand regne." (Liv. vii. c. 1.)

[2] *Mores ejus instabiles, et conatus ob indigentiam suam fere semper inutiles.*

[3] Polydore Vergil's words are "*suorum principum convocato concilio;*" by which he probably meant, as Hall certainly understood him to mean, that Henry summoned *a Parliament.* But as no Parliament was summoned between the 9th of November, 1487, and the 13th of January, 1488–9; and as the series of negotiations above detailed could not have been gone through between September and November; and as this "*principum concilium*" is expressly mentioned as having met before the battle of St. Aubin, which was fought on the 28th of July, 1488; it is clear that if he supposed it to be a Parliament (as indeed he must have done, for he speaks of *laws* being passed by it) he has made a mistake somewhere. In supposing that the succours which Henry sent to Brittany were despatched immediately after the battle of St. Aubin, and before the death of the Duke of Brittany, he was certainly mistaken. The Duke died on the 8th of September, 1488; the succours did not set out before March, 1488–9.

Modern historians have pointed out or avoided these mistakes; but have not, as it seems to me, discovered the true order and concatenation of

liament propounded the cause of Brittaine to both

events. I think it will be found that this "*principum concilium*" before which Henry propounded the case of Brittany, was not a Parliament, but a "*Great Council;*" (so called in contradistinction to the "ordinary" or "continual council," and in those days well known it seems by that name;) *i. e.* a council consisting not only of lords, spiritual and temporal, joined with the King's privy council (as has been supposed); but also of principal persons of various classes, including lawyers, burgesses, and merchants; composed in short of much the same elements as a Parliament; and specially summoned by the King for consultation in great affairs (for a fuller justification of which conjecture see Appendix No. I.): —that the *occasion* of its being summoned was not the return of the ambassadors out of France just *before* the battle of St. Aubin; but the issue of that battle, with the events which immediately followed, including the Duke's death and the new pretensions of the French King (see note 1. p. 118): —and that the *time* of its meeting was the beginning of November, 1488, only two months after the Duke's death. We know from the Herald's narrative (Cott. MSS. Jul. xii. fo. 49.) —an evidence almost conclusive on such a point—that after Whitsuntide in that year (which was on the 25th of May), "*all the summer following*" the King "hunted and sported him merely;" but that after keeping his Allhallow-tide (1st November) at Windsor, "he removed to Westminster, to *the gretest conseill that was many yers withoute the name of parliament.*" We know from the same authority that "there were at that season many ambassadors in England from foreign countries." We know from Rymer that on the 11th of December following, ambassadors were despatched from England to France, to Brittany, to Spain, and to Flanders. We know that on the 23rd of December commissions were out for raising a body of archers for the succour of Brittany. We know that Parliament met on the 13th of the following month, and voted liberal supplies for that enterprise. And we know lastly that soon after the Parliament broke up these succours were despatched. If then we suppose that Henry still hoped to carry his ends by negotiation until he heard of the battle of St. Aubin; that the result of that battle was not only unexpected, but so decisive that it did in fact put an end to the war for the time (which is true; for the treaty of Verger, which established Charles in possession of all he had won, was concluded (D'Argentré, xiii. 48.) on the 21st August), and left him no room for action, until the accession of the young Duchess and the questions arising thereupon opened a new chapter; that immediately upon this he summoned a Great Council, partly that he might feel the sense of the nation, and partly that he might pledge them to the support of the war before he committed himself; and that it was to this Great Council that he now (*i. e.* in the beginning of November, 1488) propounded the case and appealed for advice; it will be found I think that the events hang together more naturally, and suit better with the fixed data established by state documents.

houses by his chancellor Morton[1] Archbishop of Canterbury, who spake to this effect.

[1] This fact is not mentioned by Polydore, nor I think by any of the Chroniclers; from which one may suspect that Bacon had some independent source of information with regard to this speech. The speech itself however is of course to be taken, not as a report of what the Chancellor really said, but as a representation of what Bacon imagined that such a person, in such circumstances, with such ends in view, would or should have said. The same is to be understood of all the speeches in the book; the amount of invention varying inversely as the amount of actual information. If he had had a full report of the speech actually spoken, he would have given, not a transcript certainly, but the substance of it in the best and fewest words; still keeping the form of the first person. Where he had no means of knowing more than the general tenour and purpose of what was spoken, he would fill up the outline from his own head, and *make* a speech of such tenour and purpose, — the best he could. It is this which gives to these speeches their peculiar interest and value: they are so many statements of the case as Bacon conceived it, viewed from the point at which the speakers stood, and presented in a dramatic form.

This, I need hardly add, is according to the old rule of historical composition, practised by all the classical historians, and distinctly explained and avowed by Thucydides, the best and trustworthiest of them all; and Bacon could never have imagined that his speeches would be taken in any other sense. But since I find Dr. Henry gravely recording his *suspicion* "that these speeches were made by the noble historian who hath recorded them;" and the author of the chapter on "National Industry" in the *Pictorial History of England* criticising and commenting upon and drawing inferences from the words of this speech, as if it had been a document of the time; and Lord Campbell treating it as a blemish in the work that it is "filled up with proclamations and long speeches," (as if they were so much rubbish; when the speeches are in fact the most original part of it); — I must suppose that the thing is not so well understood now-a-days as to make this note superfluous.

Whether the practice is a good one or not, is another question. My own opinion is that the reader is less liable to be deceived by history written upon this principle than upon the modern plan, though the modern be apparently the more scrupulous. The records of the past are not complete enough to enable the most diligent historian to give a connected narrative, in which there shall not be many parts resting upon guesses or inferences or unauthenticated rumours. He may guess for himself, or he may report other people's guesses; but guesses there must be. And if he be a wise man and curious about the truth, those portions of his narrative which have most of his own will probably be nearest the truth. The advantage of the old practice is, that the invention appears in the undisguised form of invention; whereas the modern practice, by scrupulously eschewing

"My lords and masters, the King's Grace, our Sovereign Lord, hath commanded me to declare unto you the causes that have moved him at this time to summon this his Parliament; which I shall do in few words; craving pardon of his Grace and you all, if I perform it not as I would.

"His Grace doth first of all let you know that he retaineth in thankful memory the love and loyalty shewed to him by you at your last meeting,[1] in establishment of his royalty, freeing and discharging of his partakers, and confiscation of his traitors and rebels; more than which could not come from subjects to their sovereign in one action. This he taketh so well at your hands, as he hath made it a resolution to himself to communicate with so loving and well approved subjects

everything like avowed and deliberate invention, leaves it to be supposed that what remains is all fact; that when the writer tells you what this man said or that man thought, — carefully keeping in the third person, or quoting from a previous writer, — he is telling you something that did really happen: whereas in most cases of the kind he is but reporting his own or another man's conjecture, just as much as if he had sate down deliberately to compose a soliloquy or a speech in the first person.

[1] It seems therefore that Bacon believed this to be Henry's *second* Parliament; the Parliament *in* 3 *H. VII.;* under which description he was no doubt familiar with the records of it. But he did not know, and had not perhaps any ready means of ascertaining, in what month of Henry's third year, which extended from August 22, 1487, to August 21, 1488, it met. We have seen that in speaking of the coronation of the Queen (p. 94.) he makes no allusion to the fact that this Parliament was then sitting; which considering its importance both as a legislative and as a money-voting Parliament, (for they granted — in consideration of the rebellion just passed, I imagine, rather than of the war to come — two fifteenths and tenths,) he would naturally have done in that place. I have little doubt that, following Polydore's narrative, as all previous historians had done, and not having access to the Parliament Rolls to correct it by, he believed this second Parliament to have met in the summer of 1488. It must be supposed that authentic records as to the date of Henry's Parliaments were not easily accessible, when so diligent and original an explorer as Stowe failed to detect these errors.

in all affairs that are of public nature at home or abroad.

"Two therefore are the causes of your present assembling: the one a foreign business; the other matters of government at home.

"The French King (as no doubt ye have heard) maketh at this present hot war upon the Duke of Brittaine. His army is now before Nantes,[1] and holdeth it straitly besieged, being the principal city, if not in ceremony and preeminence, yet in strength and wealth, of that duchy: ye may guess at his hopes, by his attempting of the hardest part of the war first. The cause of this war he knoweth best. He alledgeth the entertaining and succouring of the Duke of Orleans and some other French lords, whom the King taketh for his enemies. Others divine of other matters. Both parts have by their ambassadors divers times prayed the King's aids; the French King, aids or neutrality; the Britons, aids simply; for so their case requireth. The King, as a Christian Prince and blessed son of the holy church, hath offered himself as a mediator to treat a peace between them. The French King yieldeth to

[1] This is consistent with Polydore's narrative: but it is a mistake, whatever date you assign to "now." The siege of Nantes had been raised on the 6th of August, 1487. (See note 1. p. 109.) The Chancellor however, speaking in November, 1488, had in fact a stronger case than could have been assigned to him at the time Bacon supposed him to be speaking. The victory of St. Aubin had given Charles all, and more than all, he originally pretended. The party of the Duke of Orleans was overthrown; the Duke himself was his prisoner; he had been secured by treaty in the possession of all the places he had won; yet he was now, upon the Duke of Brittany's death, claiming the right of guardianship over the young Duchess, and in the mean time proceeding in his conquests and taking town after town in Brittany. (See Daru, iii. p. 148., and compare the King's letter to Lord Oxford, quoted in note p. 148.; which shows how far the French had advanced into Brittany before the end of March, 1489.)

treat, but will not stay the prosecution of the war. The Britons, that desire peace most, hearken to it least; not upon confidence or stiffness, but upon distrust of true meaning; seeing the war goes on. So as the King, after as much pains and care to effect a peace as ever he took in any business, not being able to remove the prosecution on the one side nor the distrust on the other caused by that prosecution, hath let fall the treaty; not repenting of it, but despairing of it now, as not likely to succeed. Therefore by this narrative you now understand the state of the question, whereupon the King prayeth your advice; which is no other, but whether he shall enter into an auxiliary and defensive war for the Britons against France?

"And the better to open your understandings in this affair, the King hath commanded me to say somewhat to you from him of the persons that do intervene in this business; and somewhat of the consequence thereof, as it hath relation to this kingdom; and somewhat of the example of it in general; making nevertheless no conclusion or judgment of any point, until his Grace hath received your faithful and politic advices.

"First for the King our sovereign himself, who is the principal person you are to eye in this business; his Grace doth profess that he truly and constantly desireth to reign in peace: but his Grace saith he will neither buy peace with dishonour, nor take it up at interest of danger to ensue; but shall think it a good change, if it please God to change the inward troubles and seditions wherewith he hath been hitherto exercised into an honourable foreign war.

"And for the other two persons in this action, the French King and the Duke of Brittaine, his Grace doth

declare unto you, that they be the men unto whom he is of all other friends and allies most bounden; the one having held over him his hand of protection from the tyrant; the other having reached forth unto him his hand of help for the recovery of his kingdom; so that his affection toward them in his natural person is upon equal terms. And whereas you may have heard that his Grace was enforced to fly out of Brittaine into France for doubts of being betrayed; his Grace would not in any sort have that reflect upon the Duke of Brittaine in defacement of his former benefits; for that he is thoroughly informed that it was but the practice of some corrupt persons about him, during the time of his sickness, altogether without his consent or privity. But howsoever these things do interest his Grace in his particular, yet he knoweth well that the higher bond that tieth him to procure by all means the safety and welfare of his loving subjects, doth disinteress him of these obligations of gratitude, otherwise than thus; that if his Grace be forced to make a war he do it without passion or ambition.

"For the consequence of this action towards this kingdom, it is much as the French King's intention is. For if it be no more but to range his subjects to reason who bear themselves stout upon the strength of the Duke of Brittaine,[1] it is nothing to us. But if it be in the French King's purpose, — or if it should not be in his purpose, yet if it shall follow all one as if it were sought, — that the French King shall make a province of Brittaine and join it to the crown of France; then it is worthy the consideration how this may import England, as well in the increasement of the greatness

[1] This clause is omitted in the translation.

of France, by the addition of such a country that stretcheth his boughs unto our seas, as in depriving this nation and leaving it naked of so firm and assured confederates as the Britons have always been. For then, it will come to pass that, whereas not long since this realm was mighty upon the continent, first in territory and after in alliance, in respect of Burgundy and Brittaine, which were confederates indeed, but dependent confederates;[1] now the one being already cast partly into the greatness of France and partly into that of Austria, the other is like wholly to be cast into the greatness of France; and this island shall remain confined in effect within the salt waters, and girt about with the coast countries of two mighty monarchs.

"For the example, it resteth likewise upon the same question, upon the French King's intent. For if Brittaine be carried and swallowed up by France, as the world abroad (apt to impute and construe the actions of Princes to ambition) conceive it will, then it is an example very dangerous and universal, that the lesser neighbour estate should be devoured of the greater. For this may be the case of Scotland towards England; of Portugal towards Spain; of the smaller estates of Italy towards the greater; and so of Germany; or as if some of you of the commons might not live and dwell safely besides some of these great lords. And the bringing in of this example will be chiefly laid to the King's charge, as to him that was most interested[2] and most able to forbid it.[3] But then on the other side there is so fair a pretext on the French King's part

[1] *Fœderati ex hujus regni consiliis pendentes.*

[2] So MS.

[3] *Qui illud etiam cum bono republicæ suæ impedire maxime potuisset.*

(and yet pretext is never wanting to power) in regard the danger imminent to his own estate is such as may make this enterprise seem rather a work of necessity than of ambition, as doth in reason correct the danger of the example; for that the example of that which is done in a man's own defence cannot be dangerous, because it is in another's power to avoid it. But in all this business, the King remits himself to your grave and mature advice, whereupon he purposeth to rely."

This was the effect of the Lord Chancellor's speech touching the cause of Brittaine; for the King had commanded him to carry it so as to affect the Parliament towards the business; but without engaging the King in any express declaration.

The Chancellor went on:

"For that which may concern the government at home, the King hath commanded me to say unto you; that he thinketh there was never any King (for the small time that he hath reigned) had greater and juster cause of the two contrary passions of joy and sorrow, than his Grace hath; joy, in respect of the rare and visible favours of Almighty God, in girting the imperial sword upon his side, and assisting the same his sword against all his enemies, and likewise in blessing him with so many good and loving servants and subjects, which have never failed to give him faithful counsel, ready obedience, and courageous defence; sorrow, for that it hath not pleased God to suffer him to sheath his sword (as he greatly desired, otherwise than for administration of justice,) but that he hath been forced to draw it so oft, to cut off traitorous and disloyal subjects, whom it seems God hath left (a few amongst many good) as the Canaanites amongst the

people of Israel, to be thorns in their sides, to tempt and try them; though the end hath been always (God's name be blessed therefore) that the destruction hath fallen upon their own heads. Wherefore his Grace saith that he seeth that it is not the blood spilt in the field that will save the blood in the city; nor the marshal's[1] sword that will set this kingdom in perfect peace: but that the true way is to stop the seeds of sedition and rebellion in their beginnings, and for that purpose to devise, confirm, and quicken good and wholesome laws against riots and unlawful assemblies of people and all combinations and confederacies of them by liveries, tokens, and other badges of factious dependence; that the peace of the land may by these ordinances, as by bars of iron, be soundly bound in and strengthened, and all force both in court, country, and private houses be supprest.

"The care hereof, which so much concerneth yourselves, and which the nature of the times doth instantly call for, his Grace commends to your wisdoms.

"And because it is the King's desire that this peace wherein he hopeth to govern and maintain you, do not bear only unto you leaves, for you to sit under the shade of them in safety, but also should bear you fruit of riches, wealth, and plenty; therefore his Grace prays you to take into consideration matter of trade, as also the manufactures of the kingdom, and to repress the bastard and barren employment of moneys to usury and unlawful exchanges; that they may be (as their natural use is) turned upon commerce, and lawful and royal trading; and likewise that our people be set awork in arts and handicrafts, that the realm may

[1] So ed. 1622. The MS. has "*marshall;*" which is perhaps right.

subsist more of itself, that idleness be avoided, and the draining out of our treasure for foreign manufactures stopped. But you are not to rest here only, but to provide further that whatsoever merchandise shall be brought in from beyond the seas may be employed upon the commodities of this land; whereby the kingdom's stock of treasure may be sure to be kept from being diminished by any overtrading of the foreigner.

"And lastly because the King is well assured that you would not have him poor that wishes you rich; he doubteth not but that you will have care, as well to maintain his revenews of customs and all other natures, as[1] also to supply him with your loving aids, if the case shall so require: the rather for that you know the King is a good husband, and but a steward in effect for the public, and that what comes from you is but as moisture drawn from the earth, which gathers into a cloud and falls back upon the earth again; and you know well how the kingdoms about you grow more and more in greatness, and the times are stirring; and therefore not fit to find the King with an empty purse. More I have not to say to you, and wish that what hath been said had been better expressed: but that your wisdoms and good affections will supply. God bless your doings."[2]

It was no hard matter to dispose and affect the Parliament in this business;[3] as well in respect of the emulation between the nations,[4] and the envy at the late growth of the French monarchy; as in regard

[1] So Ed. 1622. The MS. has "and also."

[2] The Latin translation adds *Hanc orationem Cancellarius habuit, non comptam certe, sed solidam et perspicuam.*

[3] *i. e.* the business of Brittany. *Ad istud Britanniæ negotium.*

[4] *Inter nationes Angliæ et Galliæ.*

of the danger to suffer the French to make their approaches upon England, by obtaining so goodly a maritime province, full of sea-towns and havens, that might do mischief to the English, either by invasion or by interruption of traffic.

The Parliament was also moved with the point of oppression; for although the French seemed to speak reason,[1] yet arguments are ever with multitudes too weak for suspicions. Wherefore they did advise the King roundly to embrace the Britons' quarrel, and to send them speedy aids; and with much alacrity and forwardness granted to the King a great rate of subsidy[2] in contemplation of these aids. But the King,

[1] This might perhaps have been said in *July*, 1488; but hardly in November, after the Duke of Orleans and all that party were overthrown.

[2] The Parliament of November, 1487, had granted (though not with any view to the case of Brittany) two fifteenths and tenths. The Parliament of January, 1488–9, granted (and this was expressly for the succours to Brittany) "the tenth penny on men's lands and goods movable" —a rate which was expected to produce 75,000*l.* But what could have been granted in November, 1488, when there was no Parliament but only a Great Council? I take it that though a Great Council could not (properly speaking) *grant* a subsidy, yet the members composing it might have given the King sufficient security, either by promise or by actual loan, that if a Parliament were summoned a subsidy would be granted. In the first year of Henry IV. a Great Council, summoned for advice on a question of peace or war, advised war, and (in order to avoid the necessity of summoning a Parliament and imposing a general tax) agreed upon a *grant* of money from themselves. A Great Council, summoned by Henry VII. in his twelfth year (as we shall see further on) to advise of war with Scotland, advised war, and for means to carry it on, *lent* [prested] the King "every one for his part great sums of ready money;" and recommended, it seems, the raising of 40,000*l.* more by privy seals. That Great Council sat from the 24th of October to the 6th of November, 1496; and was followed by a Parliament, January 16, 1496–7, which granted the King for the Scotch war two aids and two fifteens. That this was the course taken with regard to the Scotch war in 1496, is as certain, though it is not noticed in any of our histories, as anything can be that happened so long ago: and I suppose the same course to have been taken with regard to the case of Brittany, the occasions being in all respects analogous. It is observable

both to keep a decency towards the French King, to whom he profest himself to be obliged, and indeed desirous rather to show war than to make it, sent new solemn ambassadors[1] to intimate unto him the decree of his estates, and to iterate his motion that the French would desist from hostility; or if war must follow, to desire him to take it in good part, if at the motion of his people, who were sensible of the cause of the Britons as their ancient friends and confederates, he did send them succours; with protestation nevertheless that, to save all treaties and laws of friendship, he had limited his forces,[2] to proceed in aid of the Britons, but in no wise to war upon the French, otherwise than as they maintained the possession of Brittaine. But before this formal ambassage arrived, the party of the Duke had received a great

that the old chronicler (Cott. Vitel. A. xvi. f. 161.), who was either Fabyan himself or Fabyan's great authority (for Fabyan's printed chronicle of this reign is but an abstract from this MS.), being evidently a contemporary, and a citizen of London, attentive enough to matters of loan and taxation, says expressly that at this Great Council (the nature of which he plainly understood and did not at all confound it with the Parliament which followed, and which he notices in its place) "was *granted* unto the King for the defence of the Scots 120,000*l.*" And therefore it may very well be that in like manner this "great rate of subsidy," that was given to Henry in contemplation of the aids to Brittany, was (popularly speaking) *granted* by the Great Council of November, 1488, though the legal authority for levying it had to wait for the Parliament which met in the following January.

[1] This again comes from Polydore; an error in point of date growing out of the previous error with regard to the Council. There are no traces in Rymer of such an embassy in July, 1488; but on the 11th of December following, — between the breaking up of the Great Council and the issuing of the commission for levying a body of archers for the succour of Brittany, — Christopher Urswick, Thomas Warde, and Stephen Fryon were sent to treat a peace between England and France, and also between France and the Duchess of Brittany. And this was no doubt the solemn embassy here spoken of.

[2] *Copiis suis imperare in animo habere.*

blow, and grew to manifest declination. For near the town of St. Alban in Brittaine a battle had been given, where the Britons were overthrown, and the Duke of Orleans and the Prince of Orange taken prisoners, there being slain on the Britons' part six thousand men, and amongst them the Lord Woodvile, and almost all his soldiers, valiantly fighting. And of the French part, one thousand two hundred, with their leader James Galeot a great commander.

When the news of this battle came over into England, it was time for the King (who now[1] had no subterfuge to continue further treaty, and saw before his eyes that Brittaine went so speedily for lost, contrary to his hopes; knowing also that with his people and foreigners both, he sustained no small envy and disreputation for his former delays,) to dispatch with all possible speed his succours into Brittaine; which he did under the conduct of Robert Lord Brooke, to the number of eight thousand, choice men and well armed; who having a fair wind, in few hours landed in Brittaine, and joined themselves forthwith to those Briton forces that remained after the defeat, and marched straight on to find the enemy, and encamped fast by them. The French wisely husbanding the possession of a victory, and well acquainted with the courage of the English, especially when they are fresh, kept themselves within their trenches, being strongly lodged, and resolved not to give battle. But meanwhile to harass and weary the English, they did upon all advantages set upon them with their light horse; wherein nevertheless they received commonly loss, especially by means of the English archers.

[1] The MS. omits *now*.

and doth yet continue till this day.[1] For according to the Lord Chancellor's admonition, there were that Parliament[2] divers excellent laws ordained, concerning the points which the King recommended.

First, the authority of the Star-chamber, which before subsisted by the ancient common laws of the realm, was confirmed in certain cases by act of Parliament.[3] This court is one of the sagest and noblest institutions of this kingdom. For in the distribution of courts of ordinary justice, (besides the high court of Parliament,) in which distribution the King's bench holdeth the pleas of the crown; the Common-place, pleas civil;[4] the Exchequer, pleas concerning the King's revenew; and the Chancery, the Pretorian power for mitigating the rigour of law, in case of extremity, by the conscience of a good man; there was nevertheless always reserved a high and preeminent power to the King's counsel in causes that might in example or consequence concern the state of the commonwealth; which if they were criminal, the counsel used to sit in the chamber called the Star-chamber; if civil, in the white-chamber or White-hall. And as the Chancery had the Pretorian power for equity, so the

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "to this day."

[2] This is a further proof that Bacon supposed the case of Brittany to have been propounded in Henry's *second* Parliament. Almost all the laws which are mentioned in the following paragraphs were passed by the Parliament which met on the 7th November, 1487: just a year before the meeting of the Great Council.

[3] 3 H. 7. c. 1.

[4] A very politic distribution, according to the translation. *In quâ Curia Banci Regis, criminibus quæ contra coronam committuntur; curia Banci Communis, litibus civilibus; curia Scaccarii, causis quæ ad reditus et proventus regis spectant; et Curiæ Cancellariæ, causis quæ mitigationem rigoris juris ex arbitrio boni viri, ad exemplum juris Prætorii, merentur, politice admodum assignatæ sunt.*

Star-chamber had the Censorian power for offences under the degree of capital. This court of Star-chamber is compounded of good elements; for it consisteth of four kinds of persons; counsellors, peers, prelates, and chief judges: it discerneth also principally of four kinds of causes; forces, frauds, crimes various of stellionate, and the inchoations or middle acts towards crimes capital or hainous not actually committed or perpetrated. But that which was principally aimed at by this act was force,[1] and the two chief supports of force, combination of multitudes, and maintenance or headship of great persons.

From the general peace of the country the King's care went on to the peace of the King's house, and the security of his great officers and counsellors. But this law[2] was somewhat of a strange composition and temper. That if any of the King's servants under the degree of a lord, do conspire the death of any of the King's counsel, or lord of the realm, it is made capital.[3] This law was thought to be procured by the Lord Chancellor, who being a stern and haughty man, and finding he had some mortal enemies in court, provided for his own safety; drowning the envy of it in a general law, by communicating the privilege with all other counsellors and peers; and yet not daring to extend it further than to the King's servants in check-roll, lest it should have been too harsh to the gentlemen and other commons of the kingdom, who might have thought their ancient liberty and the clemency of the laws of England invaded, *if*

[1] *Suppressio turbarum illicitarum.*

[2] 3 H. 7. c. 14.

[3] *i. e.* whether it be effected or not—*factum est crimen, licet res peracta non fuerit, capitale.*

the will in any case of felony[1] *should be made the deed.* And yet the reason which the act yieldeth (that is to say, that he that conspireth the death of counsellors may be thought indirectly and by a mean to conspire the death of the King himself) is indifferent to all subjects as well as to servants in court. But it seemeth this sufficed to serve the Lord Chancellor's turn at this time; but yet he lived to need a general law; for that he grew afterwards as odious to the country as he was then to the court.

From the peace of the King's house the King's care extended to the peace of private houses and families; for there was an excellent moral law[2] moulded thus: The taking and carrying away of women forcibly and against their will (except female wards and bondwomen) was made capital: the Parliament wisely and justly conceiving, that the obtaining of women by force into possession[3] (howsoever afterwards assent might follow by allurements) was but a rape drawn forth in length, because the first force drew on all the rest.

There was made also another law[4] for peace in general, and repressing of murders and manslaughters, and was in amendment of the common laws of the realm; being this: That whereas by the common law the King's suit, in case of homicide, did expect the year and the day, allowed to the party's suit by way of appeal;[5] and that it was found by experience that the

[1] *i. e.* in any case under the degree of treason — *alias quam in criminibus læsæ majestatis.*

[2] 3 H. 7. c. 3.

[3] *Abripiendi fœminas per vim in possessionem extraneorum.*

[4] 3 H. 7. c. 2.

[5] *i. e.* to the wife and heir of the man killed, to prosecute in their own name. *Quod spatium uxori et hæredi occisi datum est ut nomine proprio accusationem peragerent.*

party was many times compounded with, and many times wearied with the suit, so that in the end such suit was let fall; and by that time the matter was in a manner forgotten, and thereby prosecution at the King's suit by indictment (which is ever best *flagrante crimine*) neglected; it was ordained[1] that the suit by indictment might be taken as well at any time within the year and the day as after; not prejudicing nevertheless the party's suit.

The King began also then, as well in wisdom as in justice, to pare a little the privilege of clergy; ordaining that clerks convict should be burned in the hand,[2] — both because they might taste of some corporal punishment, and that they might carry a brand of infamy. But for this good act's sake, the King himself was after branded by Perkin's proclamation for an execrable breaker of the rites of holy church.

Another law was made for the better peace of the country, by which law the King's officers and farmers were to forfeit their places and holds, in case of unlawful retainer[3] or partaking in routs and unlawful assemblies.

These were the laws that were made for repressing of force, which those times did chiefly require; and were so prudently framed as they are found fit for all succeeding times, and so continue to this day.

[1] So ed. 1622. The MS. has "ordered."

[2] 4 H. 7. c. 13. This therefore belongs to the year 1489–90. Bacon perhaps confounded these two sessions; there being no hint in Polydore of a Parliament being called in January, '88–9. "Clerks convict" are clergy convicted of capital crimes. *Clerici capitalis criminis convicti.* This act was passed at the last meeting of this Parliament, Jan. 25th — Feb. 27th, 1489–90. See *Stat. of Realm*, p. 524. note.

[3] *Si famulitiis nobilium aut aliorum, nisi domestici essent, se aggregarent.* 3 H. 7. c. 15.

There were also made good and politic laws that Parliament against usury,[1] which is the bastard use of money; and against unlawful chievances and exchanges,[2] which is bastard usury; and also for the security of the King's customs; and for the employment of the procedures of foreign commodities, brought in by merchants strangers,[3] upon the native commodities of the realm; together with some other laws of less importance.

But howsoever the laws made in that Parliament did bear good and wholesome fruit; yet the subsidy granted at the same time bore[4] a fruit that proved harsh and bitter. All was inned at last into the King's barn; but it was after a storm. For when the commissioners entered into the taxation of the subsidy in Yorkshire and the bishoprick of Durham, the people upon a sudden grew into great mutiny, and said openly that they had endured of late years a thousand miseries, and neither could nor would pay the subsidy. This no doubt proceeded not simply of any present necessity, but much by reason of the old humour of those countries, where the memory of King Richard was so strong, that it lay like lees in the bottom of men's hearts, and if the vessel was but stirred it would come up; and no doubt it was partly also by the instigation of some factious malcontents

[1] 3 H. 7. c. 6.

[2] *Illicita excambia et contractus fictos.* 3 H. 7. c. 7.

[3] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "merchant strangers." See note 2. p. 100.

[4] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "bare." The events which follow were certainly in the spring of 1489. I presume therefore that the tax which caused the combustion was that of the tenth penny upon lands and goods moveable, granted in the Parliament of January, 1488–9, not the two fifteenths and tenths granted in 1487.

that bare principal[1] stroke amongst them. Hereupon the commissioners, being somewhat astonished, deferred the matter unto the Earl of Northumberland, who was the principal man of authority in those parts. The Earl forthwith wrote unto the court, signifying to the King plainly enough in what flame he found the people of those countries, and praying the King's direction. The King wrote back peremptorily that he would not have one penny abated of that which had been granted to him by Parliament; both because it might encourage other countries to pray the like release or mitigation; and chiefly because he would never endure that the base multitude should frustrate the authority of the Parliament, wherein their votes and consents were concluded. Upon this dispatch from court, the Earl assembled the principal justices and freeholders of the country; and speaking to them in the[2] imperious language wherein the King had written to him, which needed not (save that an harsh business was unfortunately fallen into the hands of a harsh man), did not only irritate the people, but make them conceive by the stoutness and haughtiness of delivery of the King's errand,[3] that himself was the author or principal persuader of that counsel: whereupon the meaner sort routed together, and suddenly assailing[4] the earl in his house, slew him[5] and divers of his servants; and rested not there, but creating for their leader Sir John Egremond, a factious person, and one that had of a

[1] So ed. 1662. The MS. has "principally."
[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "that."
[3] *Ex acerbitate verborum ejus quæ tanquam regis ipsius verba retulerat.*
[4] So ed. 1622. The MS. has "assailed."
[5] This, according to Stowe, was on the 28th of April, 1489.

long time borne an ill talent towards the King,[1] and being animated also by a base fellow, called John a Chamber, a very *boutefeu*, who bore much sway amongst the vulgar and populace,[2] entered into open rebellion, and gave out in flat terms that they would go against King Henry and fight with him for the maintenance of their liberties.

When the King was advertised of this new insurrection (being almost a fever that took him every year), after his manner little troubled therewith, he sent Thomas Earl of Surrey (whom he had a little before not only released out of the Tower and pardoned, but also received to especial favour) with a competent power against the rebels, who fought with the principal band of them and defeated them, and took alive John a Chamber their firebrand. As for Sir John Egremond, he fled into Flanders to the Lady Margaret of Burgundy, whose palace was the sanctuary and receptacle of all traitors against the King. John a Chamber was executed at York in great state; for he was hanged upon a gibbet raised a stage higher in the midst of a square gallows, as a traitor paramount; and a number of his men that were his chief complices were hanged upon the lower story round about him; and the rest were generally pardoned. Neither did the King himself omit his custom to be first or second in all his warlike exploits, making good his word which was usual with him when he heard of rebels, (that he desired but to see them). For immediately after he had sent down

[1] *Regi infensus erat.*

[2] Ed. 1622 has "popular." In the MS. the word seems to have been originally written "populare;" but the *r* has apparently been corrected into *c*. See p. 180. where the same error has been corrected in the same way.

the Earl of Surrey, he marched towards them himself in person. And although in his journey he heard news of the victory, yet he went on as far as York,[1] to pacify and settle those countries: and that done, returned to London, leaving the Earl of Surrey for his lieutenant in the northern parts, and Sir Richard Tunstal for his principal commissioner to levy the subsidy, whereof he did not remit a denier.

About the same time[2] that the King lost so good a servant as the Earl of Northumberland, he lost likewise a faithful friend and ally of James the Third King of Scotland by a miserable disaster. For this[3] unfortunate Prince, after a long smother of discontent and hatred of many of his nobility and people, breaking forth at times into seditions and alterations of court, was at last distressed by them, having taken arms and surprised the person of Prince James his son (partly by force, partly by threats that they would otherwise deliver up the kingdom to the King of England) to shadow their rebellion, and to be the titular

[1] He "departed from Hertford towards the north" on the 22nd of May. (Lel. iv. p. 246.); about two months after the forces sailed for Brittany. We are to remember therefore that the war in Brittany was going on at the same time with this rebellion. Bacon thought that the forces had returned to England two or three months before, and was not aware that Henry had any other important business on his hands at this time.

[2] This is another error of date, which came from Polydore Vergil, and was adopted by all our old chroniclers. James III. was killed on the 11th of June, 1488, nearly seven weeks before the battle of St. Aubin; while Henry was endeavouring to mediate between the King of France and the Duke of Brittany, and had so far succeeded as to cause a temporary suspension of hostilities. See note 1. p. 112. It is of some importance to remember the true date; because so great a change in Scotland, fraught with such uncertain consequences, obliged Henry to look well to his borders and strengthen Berwick, and materially affected the state of the question with regard to France.

[3] So ed. 1622. The MS. has "the."

and painted head of those arms.[1] Whereupon the King (finding himself too weak) sought unto King Henry, as also unto the Pope and the King of France, to compose those troubles between him and his subjects. The Kings accordingly interposed their mediations in a round and princely manner,[2] not only by way of request and persuasion, but also by way of protestation and menace, declaring that they thought it to be the common cause of all Kings, if subjects should be suffered to give laws unto their sovereign; and that they would accordingly resent it and revenge it. But the rebels, that had shaken off the greater yoke of obedience, had likewise cast away the lesser tie of respect; and fury prevailing above fear, made answer, that there was no talking of peace except their[3] King would resign his crown. Whereupon (treaty of accord taking no place) it came to a battle at Bannocksbourn by Strivelin. In which battle the King transported with wrath and just indignation, inconsiderately fight-

[1] In this ambiguous and hardly accurate sentence there are no marks of parenthesis either in the MS. or in the edition of 1622; and the MS. has a comma after "threats" and no stop after "England:" which, if it were right, would suggest a different meaning. But the Latin translation removes the ambiguity, and shows that the punctuation which I have substituted expresses the intended construction. *Siquidem arma contra eum sumpserunt, et Jacobi Principis filii sui personam ex improviso intra potestatem suam redegerunt, partim vi partim minis; interminantes, se aliter regnum in manus Regis Angliæ tradituros. Eo autem consilio hoc moliebantur, ut rebellionem suam obvelarent, sicque Princeps titulare et pictum quoddam caput rebellionis fieret.* Compare Buchanan, *Rer. Scot. Hist.* xii. 58.

[2] *Modo honorifico et qui reges magnos deceret.* Tytler, who mentions James's application to France and to Rome (vol. iv. p. 317.), says nothing about Henry. The circumstances here detailed come from Speed (p. 786.); who quotes as his authority John Leslie, Bishop of Rosse. A letter in the Paston correspondence, dated the 13th of May, 1488, mentions "an ambassador from the King of Scots, who is now in great trouble about his and other lords of his land." Vol. v. p. 369.

[3] MS. Ed. 1622 has "the."

ing and precipitating the charge before his whole numbers came up to him, was, notwithstanding the contrary express and strait commandment of the Prince his son, slain in the pursuit, being fled to a mill situate in the field where the battle was fought.

As for the Pope's ambassy, which was sent by Adrian de Castello an Italian legate, (and perhaps as those times were might have prevailed more,) it came too late for the ambassy, but not for the ambassador. For passing through England and being honourably entertained and received of King Henry (who ever applied himself with much respect to the see of Rome), he fell into great grace with the King, and great familiarity and friendship with Morton the Chancellor. Insomuch as the King taking a liking to him, and finding him to his mind,[1] preferred him to the bishoprick of Hereford, and afterwards to that of Bath and Wells, and employed him in many of his affairs of state that had relation to Rome. He was a man of great learning,[2] wisdom, and dexterity in business of state; and having not long after ascended to the degree of cardinal, paid the King large tribute of his gratitude in diligent and judicious advertisement[3] of the occurrents of Italy. Nevertheless in the end of his time he was partaker of the conspiracy which cardinal Alphonso Petrucci and some other cardinals had plotted against the life of Pope Leo. And this offence, in itself so hainous, was yet in him aggravated by the motive thereof; which was not

[1] *Et eum rebus suis utilem fore credens.*

[2] The Latin translation goes further and calls him a great man. *Certe vir magnus fuit Adrianus et multa eruditione, &c. præditus.*

[3] A long letter of this kind from Adrian to Henry, dated 4th June, 1504, is still to be seen in the Cotton collection. (Cleo. iii. fo. 171.).

malice or discontent, but an aspiring mind to the papacy.[1] And in this height of impiety there wanted not an intermixture of levity and folly, for that (as was generally believed) he was animated to expect the papacy by a fatal mockery; the prediction of a sooth-sayer; which was, *That one should succeed Pope Leo, whose name should be Adrian, an aged man of mean birth and of great learning and wisdom;* by which character and figure he took himself to be described; though it were fulfilled of Adrian the Fleming, son to[2] a Dutch brewer, cardinal of Tortosa, and preceptor unto Charles the Fifth; the same that, not changing his christen-name, was afterwards called Adrian the Sixth.

But these things happened in the year following, which was the fifth of this King.[3] But in the end of the fourth year the King had called again his Parliament,[4] not as it seemeth for any particular occasion of state: but the former Parliament[5] being ended somewhat suddenly (in regard of the preparation for Brittaine), the King thought he had not remunerated his people sufficiently with good laws, (which ever-

[1] *Ambitione fœda adipiscendi papatum.*

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "of."

[3] Henry's fifth year extended from 22nd August, 1489, to 21st August, 1490. "These things" therefore must mean the favour and preferment of Adrian.

[4] Meaning probably the session of October, 1489; and perhaps confounding it with the previous session in the January preceding, of which there is no notice in Polydore or in any of the succeeding chroniclers. That Parliament had been prorogued on the 23rd of February, 1488–9, and met again on the 14th of October following, — the beginning of Henry's fifth year.

[5] Meaning the Parliament which Bacon *supposed* to have been called in June or July, 1488; and to which he refers the acts passed by the Parliament of November, 1487. Understand it of the session of January, '88–9, and the words are correct enough.

more was his retribution for treasure): and finding by the insurrection in the north, there was discontentment abroad in respect of the subsidy, he thought it good for[1] to give his subjects yet further contentment and comfort in that kind. Certainly his times for good commonwealths laws did excel; so as he may justly be celebrated for the best lawgiver to this nation after King Edward the First. For his laws (whoso marks them well) are deep and not vulgar; not made upon the spur of a particular occasion for the present, but out of providence of the future; to make the estate of his people still more and more happy, after the manner of the legislators in ancient and heroical times.

First therefore he made a law suitable to his own acts and times. For as himself had in his person and marriage made a final concord in the great suit and title for the crown; so by this law he settled the like peace and quiet in the[2] private possessions of the subjects: ordaining, That Fines thenceforth should be final to conclude all strangers rights;[3] and that upon fines levied, and solemnly proclaimed, the

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 omits "for."

[2] So ed. 1622. The MS. omits "the."

[3] 4 H. 7. c. 24., passed in February, 1489–90. See *Statutes of the Realm*, p. 524. note.

Readers that are not learned in the law may perhaps find the Latin easier to understand than the English. *Ordinatum est enim ut Fines quos vocant (quod genus est transactionis cujusdam solennis) revera finales essent ad jura non partium tantum sed aliorum omnium extinguenda: ita tamen ut post fines hujusmodi levatos, et solenniter proclamatos, haberet subditus spatium quinque annorum post titulum suum devolutum, ad jus suum recuperandum aut saltem vindicandum; quod si prætermisisset, jure suo in perpetuum excluderetur.*

The *Index Vocabulorum* explains what a "fine" is: viz. *instrumentum quo hæreditates transferuntur, eamque habet vim ut omnium jura, si intra tempus non agant, extinguat.*

subject should have his time of watch for five years after his title accrued; which if he forepassed, his right should be bound for ever after; with some exception nevertheless of minors, married women, and such incompetent persons. This statute did in effect but restore an ancient statute of the realm, which was itself also made but in affirmance of the common law. The alteration had been by a statute commonly called the statute of *non-claim*,[1] made in the time of Edward the Third. And surely this law[2] was a kind of prognostic of the good peace which since his time hath (for the most part) continued in this kingdom until this day. For statutes of *non-claim* are fit for times of war, when men's heads are troubled, that they cannot intend their estate; but statutes that quiet possessions are fittest for times of peace, to extinguish suits and contentions; which is one of the banes of peace.

Another statute was made of singular policy; for the population apparently,[3] and (if it be thoroughly considered) for the soldiery and militar forces of the realm. Inclosures at that time began to be more frequent, whereby arable land (which could not be manured[4] without people and families) was turned into

[1] *Lex est quæ sub tempora belli, cum homines juri suo asserendo plerumque non vacarent, lata erat, et vim illam finium destruxit; quæ tamen postea per aliud statutum restituebatur.* (*Index Vocab.*)

[2] *i. e.* this law of Henry VII. *Ista lex de finibus levandis.*

[3] *i. e.* manifestly tending to the increase of population. *Incrementum populi regni manifesto . . . . promovens.* 4 H. 7. c. 19.; passed in February, 1489–90.

[4] *i. e.* cultivated: the word not having yet lost its general meaning. So Adam speaks to Eve (*Par. Lost*, iv. 627.) of

> "Alleys green
> Our walk at noon, with branches overgrown,
> That mock our scant *manuring*, and require
> More hands than ours to lop their wanton growth."

pasture, which was easily rid by a few herdsmen; and tenances for years, lives, and at will, (whereupon much of the yeomanry lived,) were turned into demesnes.[1] This bred a decay of people, and by consequence a decay of towns, churches, tithes, and the like. The King likewise knew full well, and in no wise forgot, that there ensued withal upon this a decay and diminution of subsidies and taxes; for the more gentlemen ever the lower books of subsidies. In remedying of this inconvenience the King's wisdom was admirable; and the Parliament's at that time. Inclosures they would not forbid, for that had been to forbid the improvement of the patrimony of the kingdom;[2] nor tillage they would not compel; for that was to strive with nature and utility:[3] but they took a course to take away depopulating inclosures and depopulating pasturage,[4] and yet not that by name,[5] or by any imperious express prohibition, but by consequence. The ordinance was, That all houses of husbandry, that were used with[6] twenty acres of ground and upwards, should be maintained and kept up for ever; together with a competent proportion of land to be used and occupied with them, and in no wise to be severed from them (as by another statute, made afterwards in his successor's time, was more fully declared): this upon

[1] *i. e.* lands kept by the lord of the manor in his own hands. *Possessiones quæ non sunt feodales, sed in manibus domini.* (*Ind. Vocab.*)

[2] *i. e.* by means of a more productive cultivation. *Soli culturam fructuosiorem, atque inde secuturam patrimonii regni meliorationem.*

[3] *Cum natura ipsa et rebus pugnare.*

[4] *i. e.* such kinds of enclosures and pasturage as manifestly induced depopulation. *Clausuras tantum et pascua quæ depopulationem liquido invehebant.*

[5] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "not by that name."

[6] *i. e.* that had annexed to them. *Quibus fuerint annexa.*

forfeiture to be taken, not by way of popular action, but by seizure of the land itself by the King and lords of the fee, as to half the profits, till the houses and lands were restored. By this means the houses being kept up did of necessity enforce a dweller; and the proportion of land for occupation being kept up, did of necessity enforce that dweller not to be a beggar or cottager, but a man of some substance, that might keep hinds and servants, and set the plough on going. This did wonderfully concern the might and mannerhood[1] of the kingdom, to have farms as it were of a standard, sufficient to maintain an able body out of penury, and did in effect amortise a great part of the lands of the kingdom unto the hold and occupation of the yeomanry or middle people, of a condition between gentlemen and cottagers or peasants. Now how much this did advance the militar power of the kingdom, is apparent by the true principles of war and the examples of other kingdoms. For it hath been held by the general opinion of men of best judgment in the wars (howsoever some few have varied, and that it may receive some distinction of case) that the principal strength of an army consisteth in the infantry or foot. And to make good infantry, it requireth men bred not in a servile or indigent fashion, but in some free and plentiful manner. Therefore if a state run most to noblemen and gentlemen, and that the husbandmen and ploughmen be but as their workfolks or[2] labourers, or else mere cottagers (which are but housed beggars), you may have a good

[1] So both the MS. and the ed. of 1622. I do not remember to have met with the word any where else. The translation gives — *Hoc populi numerum miris modis augebat, quin et potentiæ regni militaris intererat.*

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "and."

cavalry, but never good stable bands of foot; like to coppice woods, that if you leave in them staddles too thick, they will run to bushes and briars, and have little clean underwood. And this is to be seen in France and Italy (and some other parts abroad), where in effect all is noblesse or peasantry (I speak of people out of towns[1]), and no middle people; and therefore no good forces of foot: insomuch as they are enforced to employ mercenary bands of Switzers (and the like[2]) for their battalions of foot. Whereby also it comes to pass that those nations have much people and few soldiers. Whereas the King saw that contrariwise it would follow, that England, though much less in territory, yet should have infinitely more soldiers of their native forces than those other nations have. Thus did the King secretly sow Hydra's teeth; whereupon (according to the poets' fiction) should rise up armed men for the service of this kingdom.

The King also (having care to make his realm potent as well by sea as by land), for the better maintenance of the navy, ordained, That wines and woads from the parts of Gascoign and Languedoc, should not be brought but in English bottoms;[3] bowing the ancient policy of this estate from consideration of plenty to consideration of power: for that almost all the ancient statutes invite[4] (by all means) merchants strangers[5] to bring in all sorts of commodities; having for end cheapness, and not looking to the point of state concerning the naval power.

1 "*Populo in agris degente non in urbibus.*"
2 "*Helvetiorum aut Germanorum.*"
3 4 Hen. 7. c. 10.; passed February, 1489–90.
4 So MS. Ed. 1622 has "incite." The translation has *invitant.*
5 So MS. Ed. 1622 has "merchant-strangers." See note 2. p. 100.

The King also made a statute in that Parliament monitory and minatory towards justices of peace,[1] that they should duly execute their office, inviting complaints against them, first to their fellow-justices, then to the justices of assize, then to the King or Chancellor; and that a proclamation which he had published of that tenor should be read in open session four times a year, to keep them awake. Meaning also to have his laws executed,[2] and thereby to reap either obedience or forfeitures, (wherein towards his later times he did decline too much to the left hand,) he did ordain remedy against the practice that was grown in use, to stop and damp informations upon penal laws, by procuring informations by collusion to be put in by the confederates of the delinquents, to be faintly prosecuted and let fall at pleasure, and pleading them in bar of the informations which were prosecuted with effect.

He made also laws for the correction of the mint, and counterfeiting of foreign coin current.[3] And that no payment in gold should be made to any merchant

[1] 4 H. 7. c. 12.; passed February, 1489–90.

[2] The translation varies a little from the original here; for it represents this admonition to the justices, equally with the act for putting a stop to collusive informations, as attributable to the same motive; viz. his desire of forfeitures. *Hoc modo fore putabat ut leges suæ pœnales executioni demandarentur, utque inde vel obedientiæ vel mulctarum fructum perciperet: in qua re versus finem vitæ suæ declinavit nimis in partem sinistram. Hunc ad finem etiam cohibuit pragmaticam quandam, nuper ortam, quâ informationes veræ super legibus pœnalibus exhibitæ, informationibus aliis illusoriis suffocabantur, exhibitis scilicet per quosdam quos delinquentes ipsi suborndrant, ut ad libitum eorum fieret litis vel prosecutio vel desertio; atque hoc modo veras prosecutiones (scilicet ne duplex foret vexatio) regerebant.*

This is the act 4 H. 7. c. 20. passed Feb. 1489–90.

[3] *i. e.* for punishing the adulteration of foreign coin that was made current in England. *De monetaria reformanda et nummorum externorum (eorum scilicet qui edicto regio essent in usum regni recepti) adulteratione punienda.* 4 H. 7. c. 18. 23.

stranger; the better to keep treasure within the realm; for that gold was the metal that lay in least room.[1]

He made also statutes for the maintenance of drapery and the keeping of wools within the realm; and not only so, but for stinting and limiting the prices of cloth; one for the finer, and another for the coarser sort.[2] Which I note, both because it was a rare thing to set prices by statute, especially upon our home commodities; and because of the wise model[3] of this act; not prescribing prices,[4] but stinting them not to exceed a rate; that the clothier might drape accordingly as he might afford.

Divers other good statutes were made that Parliament, but these were the principal. And here I do desire those into whose hands this work shall fall, that they do take in good part my long insisting upon the laws that were made in this King's reign; whereof I have these reasons; both because it was the preeminent virtue and merit of this King,[5] to whose memory I do honour; and because it hath some correspondence to my person; but chiefly because in my judgment it is some defect even in the best writers of history, that they do not often enough summarily deliver and set down the most memorable laws that passed in the times whereof they write,[6] being indeed the principal

[1] And was therefore most easily smuggled out. *Quod facillime et occulto transportari posset.*

[2] 4 H. 7. c. 8.; passed December, 1489.

[3] *Prudens temperamentum.*

[4] *i. e.* not fixing the exact price of each kind of cloth; but only the maximum. The clothier was free to sell as *cheap* as he pleased. *Quod pretia præcise pannorum diversi generis non præscriberet, sed sanciret tantum, &c.*

[5] *Ut optimus legislator esset.*

[6] The edition of 1622 has *writ.* In the MS. it seems to me that *writt* has

acts of peace. For though they may be had[1] in original books of law themselves; yet that informeth not the judgment of kings and counsellors and persons of estate so well as to see them described and entered in the table and portrait of the times.

About the same time the King had a loan from the City[2] of four thousand pounds, which was double to that they lent before, and was duly and orderly paid back at the day, as the former likewise had been: the King ever choosing rather to borrow too soon than to pay too late, and so keeping up his credit.

Neither had the King yet cast off his cares and hopes touching Brittaine,[3] but thought to master the

been corrected into *write*, the second *t* being turned into *e*, — not struck out, as the compositor perhaps supposed.

[1] *Maxima ex parte reperiri soleant.*

[2] According to Fabyan (a good authority on such a point) the King borrowed this sum in his third year; *i. e.* 1487–8. And according to the old chronicle (Cott. Vitel. A. xvi.) — which seems to deserve quite as much credit as Fabyan, if not more, — he borrowed another sum of 2000*l.* in July, 1488: in contemplation perhaps of troubles on his Scotch borders; James III. having been killed just before.

[3] In returning to the business of Brittany, it will be remembered that we left the English forces, not returning unsuccessful (as Bacon, following Polydore, supposed), but preparing to embark. They arrived in Brittany in the beginning of April, 1489, and were in full operation there all the time that the actions in Flanders which Bacon is now proceeding to relate were going on. Had Bacon known this, he would no doubt have connected the two actions together in quite a different way, and seen that the succours to the Duchess in Brittany and to Maximilian in Flanders were the two parts of a simultaneous and combined movement to stop the French King's progress. What the success of it was I will explain presently. In the meantime the following letter from Henry himself to Lord Oxford will put the reader in possession of the true state of affairs in that quarter at the time of which Bacon is now speaking. As it is very characteristic as well as concise, I transcribe it at length, from the Paston Letters, vol. v. p. 370.

"Right trusty and entirely beloved cousin, we greet you well. Inasmuch as it hath liked God to send us good tidings out of Bretayn, such as

occasion by policy, though his arms had been unfortunate, and to bereave the French King of the fruit

we doubt not but ye be desirous to understand, we write unto you of them as they be comen to our knowledge and as followeth.

"The Lord Malpertuis, now lately with us in ambassade from our dear cousin the Duchess of Bretayne, shipped at our port of Dartmouth and arrived at St. Paul de Lyon in Bretayn on Palm Sunday at four afternoon [Palm Sunday in 1489 fell on the 12th of April], from whence he wrote us the disposition and the state of the country there, and of the landing and the demeaning of our army. We received his writing on Monday last at evensong time. And because he was of Bretayn born and favourable to that party, we ne gave such trust to his tidings as was thought to us surety to write to you thereupon. This day after high mass cometh unto us out of Bretayn foresaid, and with a new ambassade from our said cousin, Fawcon, one of our pursuivants, that ratifieth the news of the said Lord Malpertuis; which ben these: —

"After the garrison of Frenchmen in the town of Gyngham [*Guincamp*] had certainty of the landing of our army, they drew down the fabours [*portcullises or fauxbourgs*] of Gyngham and made them meet to defend a siege. But as soon as they understood that our army journeyed towards them, they left the same Gyngham, where our said army arrived the Thursday next before Palm Sunday, and was received with procession, lodged and received and refreshed in the town four days. And going towards the said Duchess they must pass to the castle and borough of Moncouter. In that castle was also a garrison of Frenchmen, which incontinently upon word that our said army drew towards them, the Frenchmen did cast down great part of the walls, and fled from thence. In that castle and borough our said army kept their Easter. The castle of Chauson adjoining near to the town of St. Bryak [*Brieu*] was also garrisoned with Frenchmen. That castle they set on fire and so fled in. The towns of Henebone and Vannes were garrisoned with Frenchmen which brake down the walls of the towns and put themselves to flight. The inhabitants about Brest have laid siege thereunto and gotten the Base Court of the Frenchmen or the departing of our said pursuivant. The garrison of the town of Concarneau, which is one of the greatest strengths of all Bretayn, was besieged in likewise and driven to that necessity that they within offered or his departing to avoid the town with staff in hand. How that is taken, or what more is done sithence, he cannot tell.

"Our said cousin the Duchess is in her city of Rennes; and our right trusty Knight and Counsellor Sir Richard Edgecomb there also, having chief rule about her. And the Marshal of Bretayne arredieth him to join with them in all haste and with a good band of men. Many noblemen of that country repair to our said army to take their party.

"These premises in substance we have by writing as well from the

of his victory. The sum of his design was to encourage Maximilian to go on with his suit for the marriage of Anne the heir of Brittaine, and to aid him to the consummation thereof. But the affairs of Maximilian were at that time in great trouble and combustion, by a rebellion of his subjects in Flanders, especially those of Bruges and Gaunt; whereof the town of Bruges (at such time as Maximilian was there in person) had suddenly armed in tumult, and slain some of his principal officers, and taken himself prisoner, and held him in durance till they had enforced him and some of his counsellors to take a solemn oath to pardon all their offences, and never to question and revenge the same in time to come. Nevertheless Frederick the Emperor would not suffer this reproach and indignity offered to his son to pass, but made sharp wars upon Flanders to reclaim and chastise the rebels.[1] But the Lord Ravenstein[2] a principal person about Maximilian and one that had taken the oath of abolition[3] with his master, pretending the religion thereof, but indeed upon private ambition, and as it was thought instigated and corrupted from France, forsook the Emperor and Maximilian his lord, and made himself an head of the popular party, and seized upon the towns of

chief captains of our said army as from our Comptroller foresaid: and that our said army, blessed be God, hath among themself kept such love and accord that no manner of fray or debate hath been between them sithens the time of their departing out of this our realm.

"Given under our signet at our castle at Hertford the 22 day of April."

So far therefore the measures taken by Henry were prospering; and bearing this in mind we may now proceed with Bacon's narrative.

[1] This clause is omitted in the translation.

[2] *Ravelston* in MS.

[3] That is, the oath just mentioned, that he would pardon their offences, &c. This oath had been taken on the 16th of May, 1488. See Sismondi.

Ipre and Sluce with both the castles; and forthwith sent to the Lord Cordes,[1] governor of Picardy under the French King, to desire aid, and to move him that he on the behalf of the French King would be protector of the united towns, and by force of arms reduce the rest. The Lord Cordes was ready to embrace the occasion, which was partly of his own setting, and sent forthwith greater forces than it had been possible for him to raise on the sudden if he had not looked for such a summons before, in aid of the Lord Ravenstein and the Flemings, with instructions to invest the towns between France and Bruges. The French forces besieged a little town called Dixmue,[2] where part of the Flemish forces joined with them. While they lay at this siege, the King of England, upon pretence of the safety of the English pale about Calais, but in truth being loth that Maximilian should become contemptible and thereby be shaken off by the states of Brittaine about his[3] marriage, sent over the Lord Morley with a thousand men unto the Lord Daubigny, then deputy of Calais, with secret instructions to aid Maximilian and to raise the siege of Dixmue. The Lord Daubigny (giving it out that all was for the strengthening of the English marches) drew out of the garrisons of Calais, Hammes and Guines, to the number of a thousand men more: so that with the fresh succours that came

[1] Rapin spells the name *Desquerdes*. The particulars which follow seem to come from Hall, whose narrative is much fuller than Polydore's here. He quotes the *Flemish Chronicle*, from which I suppose he had the additional details.

[2] So spelt both in the MS. and the edition of 1622. Now called *Dixmude*.

[3] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "this marriage."

under the conduct of the Lord Morley, they made up to the number of two thousand or better. Which forces joining with some companies of Almaynes, put themselves into Dixmue, not perceived by the enemies; and passing through the town (with some reinforcement from the forces that were in the town) assailed the enemies' camp, negligently guarded as being out of fear, where there was a bloody fight, in which the English and their partakers obtained the victory, and slew to the number of eight thousand men, with the loss on the English part of a hundred or thereabouts; amongst whom was the Lord Morley. They took also their great ordnance, with much rich spoils, which they carried to Newport;[1] whence the Lord Daubigny returned to Calais, leaving the hurt men and some other voluntaries in Newport. But the Lord Cordes being at Ipre with a great power of men, thinking to recover the loss and disgrace of the fight at Dixmue, came presently on and sat down before Newport and besieged it; and after some days siege, he resolved to try the fortune of an assault; which he did one day,[2] and succeeded therein so far, that he had taken the principal tower and fort in that city, and planted upon it the French banner; whence nevertheless they were presently beaten forth by the English, by the help of some fresh succours of archers, arriving by good fortune (at the instant) in the haven of Newport. Whereupon the Lord Cordes, discouraged, and measuring the new succours which were small by the success which was great, left[3] his siege. By this means

[1] A town at the mouth of the river on which Dixmude stands.

[2] This was on Midsummer's Day, 1489. See the Herald's journal. Cott. Jul. xi. f. 55.

[3] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "levied."

matters grew more exasperate between the two Kings of England and France, for that in the war of Flanders the auxiliary forces of French and English were much blooded one against another; which blood rankled the more, by the vain words of the Lord Cordes, that declared himself an open enemy of the English, beyond that that appertained to the present service; making it a common by-word of his, That he could be content to lie in hell seven years so he might win Calais from the English.

The King having thus upheld the reputation[1] of Maximilian, advised him now to press on his marriage with Brittaine to a conclusion; which Maximilian accordingly did; and so far forth prevailed both with the young lady and with the principal persons about her, as the marriage was consummate by proxy[2] with a ceremony at that time in these parts new. For she was not only publicly contracted, but stated as a bride, and solemnly bedded, and after she was laid, there came in Maximilian's ambassador with letters of procuration,

[1] *Res et existimationem.*

[2] Polydore Vergil, from whom all this comes, does not give the date of this proxy-marriage, and the diligence of modern French historians does not seem to have succeeded in fixing it with certainty. It is said to have been performed with such secrecy that even the servants of the Duchess were not aware of it for some time. If so — and the existence of a doubt as to the date of such an event makes it probable that secrecy was affected, though it does not oblige us to believe with Rapin that neither Henry nor Charles knew of it for above a twelvemonth after — the object must have been to keep it from Charles; and we need not seek so far as Bacon does to account for Maximilian's being content with a marriage by proxy: had he gone to Brittany in person, the secret would have been harder to keep.

Lingard dates the marriage as late as April, 1491; which must be wrong; for there is a commission extant dated the 29th of March in that year, in which the marriage is distinctly mentioned. See Rymer, xii. 438. D'Argentré (xiii. 56.) puts it about the beginning of November, 1490.

and in the presence of sundry noble personages, men and women, put his leg (stript naked to the knee) between the espousal sheets, to the end that that ceremony might be thought to amount to a consummation and actual knowledge. This done, Maximilian (whose property was to leave things then when they were almost comen to perfection, and to end them by imagination; like ill archers, that draw not their arrows up to the head; and who might as easily have bedded the lady himself[1] as to have made a play and disguise of it,) thinking now all assured, neglected for a time his further proceeding, and intended his wars.[2] Meanwhile

[1] Besides the reasons suggested in the last note, it must be remembered that Anne did not complete her fourteenth year till the 26th of January, 1490–1. See Daru, iii. p. 84.

[2] What then became of the English forces in Brittany? Polydore Vergil did not know they were there; the old English historians, following Polydore without suspicion, do not raise the question; the modern, by correcting Polydore's dates, raise, but do not perfectly answer it. There they were however all this time; and it is particularly important with reference to Henry's administration to know when and under what circumstances they came back. For it was the most considerable move in the game, and was regarded by Bacon as the single exception to the good fortune of Henry's military enterprises; and one so little in keeping with the rest that he is obliged to impute it to an accident, for which through want of political foresight he had neglected to provide. French historians supply us with the true story, and show that this business was in fact no exception, but a striking illustration both of the qualities and the fortune which Bacon ascribes to him.

I have already explained that the expedition was planned with great deliberation, and formed part of a combined movement, in conjunction with Spain and Flanders, to arrest the French King's progress in the reduction of Brittany. In pursuance of this plan Spain threatened France in the south at Fontarabia; Maximilian, though hampered with troubles at home, contrived with Henry's assistance to effect an important diversion in the north; at the same time secretly and successfully pressing his suit for the young Duchess's hand; and the English forces in Brittany meanwhile, if they gained no brilliant successes over the French, yet effectually stopped their career of conquest: the result of all which was that Charles gave up the attempt to carry his ends that way. It has in-

the French King (consulting with his divines, and finding that this pretended consummation was rather

deed been stated, not only by Polydore Vergil and those also who followed him, but by modern writers with better information, that Henry not only failed to give these forces due support and encouragement while they were there, but recalled them in less than six months, — that is before the stipulated time of service had expired. But this is surely a mistake, arising from some attempt to *combine* Bacon's narrative with the facts derived from Rymer's Fœdera and the Breton archives, instead of setting it aside altogether, as inconsistent with them and resting itself upon no better authority than Polydore's. The fact is that in the middle of August, 1489, which was the fifth month after their landing, Henry instead of recalling was reinforcing them. (See Rymer, xii. 337.; also Calendar of Patent Rolls, where we find commissions issued on the 14th, 15th, and 16th of August for the raising of a force "destined for Brittany;" and compare Lobineau, i. p. 805.); and (not to attempt to trace with exactness, the separate operations of the many causes which conspired to bring about the total result) the end of it all was that Charles consented soon after to make peace, on terms by no means disadvantageous to Brittany. By the treaty of Frankfort, concluded between him and Maximilian sometime in the autumn of 1489, it was agreed that Charles should restore to the Duchess all the towns which he had conquered since her father's death (except three or four which were to be held in trust by the Duke of Bourbon and the Prince of Orange until the differences should be amicably settled; for which purpose a congress was to be holden at Tournay in the following April); that he should in the meantime withdraw his troops out of Brittany, and that she should dismiss her foreign auxiliaries. "Et vuyderont" (says D'Argentré) "les gens de guerre François de Bretagne, comme aussi la Duchesse feroit vuyder les Anglois." This treaty was accepted by the Duchess, according to Lobineau, in November, 1489; whereupon the English forces would of course be withdrawn, or if they remained it was only pending the payment of expenses.

We see therefore that there is no ground for regarding the issue of this enterprise as a thing requiring explanation or apology. If it did not aim to accomplish much, it is not the less characteristic of Henry on that account. What it did aim at it accomplished; and it does not appear to have been his fault if the winning of the move did not secure the game. The project of marriage between Maximilian and the Duchess was so far advanced that a commission for consummating it by proxy was issued (D'Argentré, xiii. 56.) on the 23rd of March, 1489 — that is, I presume, 1489–90, though it matters not to the present question to which year the date belongs — and had it been regularly completed, which might (it seems) have been done if Maximilian had not left it when it was all but done, Charles would apparently have been fairly checkmated. As it was, he was obliged to quit the attempt to possess himself of Brittany by

an invention of court than any ways valid by the laws of the church,) went more really[1] to work; and by secret instruments and cunning agents, as well matrons about the young lady as counsellors, first sought to remove the point of religion and honour out of the mind of the lady herself; wherein there was a double labour; for Maximilian was not only contracted unto the lady, but Maximilian's daughter was likewise contracted to King Charles: so as the marriage halted upon both feet, and was not clear on either side. But for the contract with King Charles, the exception lay plain and fair; for that Maximilian's daughter was under years of consent, and so not bound by law; but a power of disagreement left to either part.[2] But for the contract made by Maximilian with the lady herself, they were harder driven: having nothing to allege, but that it was done without the consent of her sovereign lord King Charles, whose ward and client she was, and he to her in place of a father; and therefore it was void and of no force, for want of such consent. Which defect (they said) though it would not evacuate a marriage after cohabitation and actual consummation, yet it was enough to make void a contract. For as for the pretended consummation, they made sport with it, and said that it was an argument that Maximilian was a widower, and a cold wooer, that could content himself to be a bridegroom by deputy, and would not make a little journey to put all out of question. So that the young lady wrought upon by

force, and try it another way. In all respects therefore, the enterprise appears to have been planned with characteristic caution and concluded with characteristic success.

[1] *Magis solide.*

[2] This clause is omitted in the translation.

these reasons, finely instilled by such as the French King (who spared for no rewards or promises) had made on his side; and allured likewise by the present glory and greatness of King Charles (being also a young king and a bachelor); and loth to make her country the seat of a long and miserable war; secretly yielded to accept of King Charles. But during this secret treaty with the lady, the better to save it from blasts of opposition and interruption, King Charles resorting to his wonted arts, and thinking to carry the marriage as he had carried the wars, by entertaining the King of England in vain belief, sent a solemn ambassage[1] by Francis Lord of Luxemburgh, Charles

[1] I have not succeeded in absolutely fixing the date of this embassy. But the circumstance which Polydore Vergil is least likely to have been mistaken in relating, and of which the date can be fixed with the nearest approach to certainty, appears to be this; that the ambassadors whom Henry despatched with the *answer* to this embassy, met on their way, at Calais, a legate of the Pope, who was on his way to England. And though Polydore says that the legate came from *Pope Alexander VI. who had just succeeded Pope Innocent* (in which case it must have been at least as late as August, 1492, after Charles and Anne were married and while England and France were at war)—yet I suppose it was more likely that he should have made a mistake as to the date of Pope Innocent's death than as to the circumstance of an accidental meeting at Calais between the ambassadors and a legate from the Pope.

Taking this then as a fixed point, the date of the "solemn ambassage" here mentioned may be set with some confidence in November or December, 1489. We know from the Herald's journal (Jul. xii. fo. 61. *b*) that during Christmas in that year there was in England "a great ambassade of France, that is to say *Francois Mons. de Luxembourgh*, Viscount of Geneve, and *the General of the order of the Trinity in France;* which on St. John's Day dined at the King's board:"—that "anon after" Candlemas Day (*i. e.* Feb. 2nd, 1489–90) ". . . the ambassadors of France had soon their answer, were right greatly and largely rewarded, and well conduct to the sea side by the King's almoner and Sir John Rysley, Knt.:"—that "soon after the King sent a great ambassage into France" (probably that of which the commission bears date 27th February; see Rymer), "that is to say, the Lord Privy Seal, Bishop of Exeter, the Earl of Ormond, the Queen's chamberlain, and the Prior of Christ Church of Can-

Marignian, and Robert Gagvien, general of the order of the *bons-hommes* of the Trinity, to treat a peace and league with the King; accoupling it with an article in the nature of a request, that the French King might with the King's good will (according unto his right of seigniory and tutelage) dispose of the marriage of the young Duchess of Brittaine as he should think good, offering by a judicial proceeding to make void the marriage of Maximilian by proxy. Also all this while the better to amuse the world, he did continue in his court and custody the daughter of Maximilian, who formerly had been sent unto him to be bred and educated in France, not dismissing or renvoying her,[1] but contrariwise professing and giving out strongly that he meant to proceed with that match; and that for the Duchess of Brittaine, he desired only to preserve his right of seigniory, and to give her in marriage to some such ally as might depend upon him.

When the three commissioners came to the court of England, they delivered their ambassage unto the King, who remitted them to his counsel; where some days after they had audience, and made their proposition by the Prior of the Trinity (who though he were third in place, yet was held the best speaker of them) to this effect:[2]

terbury:" — and that "after Mid-Lent ensuing" (Mid-Lent Sunday in 1490 fell on the 21st of March) "there came to the King divers and many ambassadors, — that is to say, *a Legate from the Pope*," &c. Under these circumstances, the ambassadors on their way to Paris and the Pope's legate on his way to England would very likely meet at Calais.

It is true, on the other hand, that there is in Rymer a safe conduct for the three persons named by Bacon, dated the 10th of December, and entered as belonging to Henry's sixth year; which would be 1490; a date probable enough in itself.

[1] So ed. 1622. The MS. omits "her."

[2] *Is locutus esse perhibetur in hunc modum.* There is nothing in Polydore

"My lords, the King our master, the greatest and mightiest King that reigned in France since Charles the great whose name he beareth, hath nevertheless thought it no disparagement to his greatness at this time to propound a peace, yea and to pray a peace, with the King of England. For which purpose he hath sent us his commissioners, instructed and enabled with full and ample power to treat and conclude; giving us further in charge to open in some other business the secrets of his own intentions. These be indeed the precious love tokens between great Kings, to communicate one with another the true state of their affairs, and to pass by nice points of honour, which ought not to give law unto affection.[1] This I do assure your lordships; it is not possible for you to imagine the true and cordial love that the King our master beareth to your sovereign, except you were near him as we are. He useth his name with so great respect, he remembereth their first acquaintance at Paris with so great contentment, nay he never speaks of him, but that presently he falls into discourse of the miseries of great Kings, in that they cannot converse with their equals, but with their[2] servants. This affection to your King's person and virtues God hath put into the heart

or Speed, nor I think in any of the English chroniclers who preceded Bacon, from which it can be gathered that the Prior was the spokesman. It may indeed be reasonably conjectured from the account which Bernard Andrè gives of the matter (Cott. Domit. A. xviii. 193.) that it was so, and several of the particulars that follow may have been taken from this source. But there are several others which could not have been extracted either from Polydore or André, and which show that Bacon had some source of information independent of them. How much of what follows is derived from such a source, and how much is Bacon's own, it is impossible to know.

[1] *Quæ affectui alicui insigni postponi debent.*

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 omits "their."

of our master, no doubt for the good of Christendom, and for purposes yet unknown to us all; for other root it cannot have, since it was the same to the Earl of Richmond that it is now to the King of England. This is therefore the first motive that makes our King to desire peace and league with your sovereign; good affection, and somewhat that he finds in his own heart. This affection is also armed with reason of estate. For our King doth in all candour and frankness of dealing open himself unto you, that having an honourable, yea and holy[1] purpose, to make a voyage and war in remote parts, he considereth that it will be of no small effect in point of reputation to his enterprise, if it be known abroad that he is in good peace with all his neighbour princes, and specially with the King of England, whom for good causes he esteemeth most.

"But now my lords give me leave to use a few words, to remove all scruples and misunderstandings between your sovereign and ours, concerning some late actions; which if they be not cleared, may perhaps hinder this peace; to the end that for matters past neither King may conceive unkindness of other, nor think the other conceiveth unkindness of him. The late actions are two; that of Brittaine, and that of Flanders. In both which it is true that the subjects' swords of both Kings have encountered and stricken, and the ways and inclinations also of the two Kings in respect of their confederates and allies have severed.

"For that of Brittaine; the King your sovereign knoweth best what hath passed. It was a war of necessity on our master's part. And though the motives

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "a holy."

of it were sharp and piquant as could be, yet did he make that war rather with an olive-branch than a laurel-branch in his hand; more desiring peace than victory.[1] Besides from time to time he sent as it were blank papers to your King to write the conditions of peace. For though both his honour and safety went upon it, yet he thought neither of them too precious to put into the King of England's hands. Neither doth our King on the other side make any unfriendly interpretation of your King's sending of succours to the Duke of Brittaine; for the King knoweth well that many things must be done of Kings for satisfaction of their people; and it is not hard to discern what is a King's own. But this matter of Brittaine is now by the act of God ended and passed; and, as the King hopeth, like the way of a ship in the sea, without leaving any impression in either of the Kings' minds; as he is sure for his part it hath not done in his.

"For the action of Flanders; as the former of Brittaine was a war of necessity, so this was a war of justice; which with a good King is of equal necessity with danger of estate; for else he should leave to be a King. The subjects of Burgundy[2] are subjects in chief to the crown of France, and their Duke the homager and vassal of France. They had wont to be good subjects, howsoever Maximilian hath of late distempered them. They fled to the King for justice and deliverance from oppression. Justice he could not

[1] This clause is omitted in the translation.

[2] *Subditi Burgundiæ:* meaning (it would seem) the Flemings. It was through his marriage with the heiress of Burgundy that they became Maximilian's subjects; and it was as subjects of Burgundy that the King of France claimed to be their lord in chief. In p. 222. the word "Flemings" in the English is rendered by *Burgundos* in the Latin.

deny; purchase[1] he did not seek. This was good for Maximilian if he could have seen it: in people mutined to arrest fury, and prevent despair. My lords, it may be this I have said is needless, save that the King our master is tender in any thing that may but glance upon the friendship of England. The amity between the two Kings no doubt stands entire and inviolate. And that their subjects' swords have clashed, it is nothing unto the public peace of the crowns; it being a thing very usual in auxiliary forces of the best and straitest confederates to meet and draw blood in the field. Nay many times there be aids of the same nation on both sides, and yet it is not for all that a kingdom divided in itself.

"It resteth my lords that I impart unto you a matter that I know your lordships all will much rejoice to hear; as that which importeth the Christian commonweal more than any action that hath happened of long time.[2] The King our master hath a purpose and determination to make war upon the kingdom of Naples, being now in the possession of a bastard slip of Arragon; but appertaining unto his majesty by clear and undoubted right; which if he should not by just arms seek to recover, he could neither acquit his honour nor answer it to his people. But his noble and christian thoughts rest not here: for his resolution and hope is,[3] to make the reconquest of Naples but as a bridge to transport his forces into Grecia, and not to spare blood or treasure (if it were to the impawning his crown and

[1] Meaning *profit*, the ordinary meaning of the word at that time. *Emolumentum aliquod sibi ipsi minime expetebat.*

[2] *Post nostram memoriam.*

[3] *Spe enim haud levi non inflatur quidem sed fulcitur.*

dispeopling of France) till either he hath overthrown the empire of the Ottomans, or taken it in his way to paradise. The King knoweth well that this is a design that could not arise in the mind of any King that did not steadfastly look up unto God, whose quarrel this is, and from whom cometh both the will and the deed. But yet it is agreeable to the person that he beareth (though unworthy) of the Thrice Christian King, and the eldest son of the church; whereunto he is also invited by the example (in more ancient time) of King Henry the Fourth of England, (the first renowned King of the House of Lancaster; ancestor though not progenitor[1] to your King;) who had a purpose towards the end of his time (as you know better) to make an expedition into the Holy-land; and by the example also (present before his eyes) of that honourable and religious war which the King of Spain now maketh and hath almost brought to perfection, for the recovery of the realm of Granada from the Moors. And although this enterprise may seem vast and unmeasured, for the King to attempt that by his own forces, wherein (heretofore) a conjunction of most of the Christian Princes hath found work enough;[2] yet his Majesty wisely considereth, that sometimes smaller forces being united under one command are more effectual in proof (though not so promising in opinion and fame) than much greater forces variously compounded by associations and leagues, which commonly in a short time after their beginnings turn to dissoci-

[1] *Ancestor* seems to be used here simply in the sense of *predecessor*; by which word it is translated in the Latin. *Prædecessor quidem licet non progenitor regis vestri.*

[2] *Non sine magnis doloribus et diuturno bello olim confecerunt.*

make his profit of this business of Brittaine, as a quarrel for war; and of that of Naples, as a wrench and

outwardly at least, more desperate than in the preceding November. It seems early, therefore, for Henry to "give it for lost." Whether Bacon had sufficient grounds for the conclusion we cannot tell, without knowing what information he had about these negotiations (for it is clear from the many little particulars which he adds that he had some) besides what he found in Polydore. It is certainly possible that, even in February, 1489-90, Henry saw so far into Charles's design, and thought it so likely that the Duchess would end the quarrel by marrying him, that (in that sense) he did begin to "give Brittany for lost," and resolved not to entangle himself further in a fruitless quarrel. And if Bacon had any *positive* ground for the assertion, it is in that sense it must be understood. If however it was only an *inference* from what went before and followed (which is perhaps more likely) it must be remembered that Bacon was proceeding upon false grounds. He was going upon the supposition that the French had had their own way in Brittany, without any effectual check, since the battle of St. Aubin. He knew nothing of the events of 1489, or of the treaty of Frankfort; of which not the slightest hint is to be found in any of our old historians. And believing (what may after all be true) that the negotiation he was speaking of took place in the spring of 1491, he was endeavouring to conceive the case as it would have been then. By that time Henry might very well have perceived that there was no prospect of preserving the independence of Brittany but by a greater war than it was worth. And the obvious inadequacy and ineffectiveness of the measures which he took, if that were his object, coupled with their singular efficacy and success, if money was his object, may have suggested to Bacon this explanation of his motives.

The main fact however, — viz. that Henry met this conciliatory move on the part of Charles with some extravagant demand which induced a breach, — is distinctly stated by Bernard André (*tandem inter eos decretum est ut si tributum non solverent bellum in eos brevi struereturr;*) and may indeed be gathered from Polydore's narrative, though he put a different construction upon it. "*Angli enim legati* (he says) *ut pauca tandem quæ cupiebant assequerentur, permulta postulabant: Franci autem, ut nihil in fine concederent, omnia repudiabant, stomachabantur, pernegabant,*" &c. Polydore took it for a case of ordinary higgling; one party hoping to get as much as he wanted by beginning with a demand for more, — the other making the extravagance of the first demand a pretence for refusing all. But this is merely a speculation — Polydore's way of accounting for what he supposed to be Henry's disappointment. With this we need not trouble ourselves. He seems to have been a mere scholar, without any historical faculty except that of concise and fluent narrative; his selection of circumstances is guided by no insight into the meaning of the thing; and the

mean for peace; being well advertised how strongly the King was bent upon that action. Having there-

general reflexions in which he now and then indulges are mere moral commonplaces. In a case like this however, the very shallowness of his interpretation is an argument for accepting his evidence as to the fact; viz. that Henry's demands were unreasonable, and that Charles refused to entertain them. Indeed there is other evidence to show that early in 1490 Henry, whatever his motive may have been, had in fact made up his mind to break with Charles, and was taking his measures with that view. On the 15th of February the Duchess of Brittany engaged, among other things, not to marry nor to make war or peace without his consent. In the course of the summer, besides sending a new army to her assistance (see a number of entries in an account of "payments made at the King's receipt," between Whitsuntide and Michaelmas, 1490; Chapter House Records, A. 8. 19. pp. 77–95., Rolls house), he had concluded treaties with Ferdinand and Maximilian, by which each of the three powers was bound under certain contingencies to join the others in an invasive war against Charles. See Rymer. It appears also from the Calendar of Patent Rolls that during all this spring and summer he was looking carefully to his own coasts and borders, as if the war might be brought to his own doors at any moment. On the 20th of May the Earl of Surrey was appointed warden-general of the marches of England towards Scotland, with full power to array and muster the men of Northumberland, and to treat with agents of the Scotch King. On the 22nd he was directed to publish a proclamation ordering home all the idle and vagrant Scots that had overrun the country. On the 26th a commission of survey and array was sent to the noblemen and gentlemen of Kent, with special injunction "to place beacons for forewarning the people of the advent of the King's enemies." Similar commissions were issued from time to time during June, July, and August, to the other counties on the southern, and southern part of the eastern, coast. On the 8th of July a writ was issued for the impressment of twenty-four gunners for the defence of the town of Calais. Interspersed among these are several commissions (the earliest dated May 22, the latest July 17) in which mention is made of ships proceeding to sea "in resistance of the King's enemies there congregating." One of the 20th of June speaks of "*the present voyage to Brittany.*" And on the 17th of September following, public proclamation was directed to be made in all the counties of England of the confederation above mentioned between the King of England, the King of the Romans, and the King and Queen of Spain, "to make actual war against Charles the French King, if he invade them or the Duchess of Brittany."

It is possible however that the precautions taken for the security of the English coasts had reference to Perkin Warbeck, who was now beginning to stir, rather than to any apprehension of a French invasion.

fore conferred divers times with his counsel, and keeping himself somewhat close, he gave a direction to the Chancellor for a formal answer to the ambassadors; and that he did in the presence of his counsel. And after, calling the Chancellor to him apart, bad him speak in such language as was fit for a treaty that was to end in a breach; and gave him also a special caveat, that he should not use any words to discourage the voyage of Italy. Soon after the ambassadors were sent for to the counsel, and the Lord Chancellor spake to them in this sort:[1]

"My lords ambassadors, I shall make answer by the King's commandment unto the eloquent declaration of you my lord Prior, in a brief and plain manner. The King forgetteth not his former love and acquaintance with the King your master. But of this there needeth no repetition; for if it be between them as it was, it is well; if there be any alteration, it is not words will[2] make it up. For the business of Brittaine, the King findeth it a little strange that the French King maketh mention of it as matter of well deserving at his hand. For that deserving was no more but to make him his instrument to surprise one of his best confederates. And for the marriage, the King would not meddle in it, if your master would marry by the book,[3] and not by the sword. For that of Flanders, if the subjects of Burgundy had appealed to your King as their chief lord, at

[1] *In hunc modum locutus fertur.*

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "that will."

[3] *Liturgiâ.* This must not be understood as referring to the French King's intention to marry the Duchess himself, for that was not yet in question; but to the right which he claimed of disposing of her in *marriage.*

first,[1] by way of supplication, it might have had a shew of justice. But it was a new form of process, for subjects to imprison their prince first, and to slay his officers, and then to be complainants. The King saith that sure he is, when the French King and himself sent to the subjects of Scotland (that had taken arms against their King,) they both spake in another stile, and did in princely manner signify their detestation of popular attentates upon the person or authority Princes. But, my lords ambassadors, the King leaveth these two actions thus. That on the one side he hath not received any manner of satisfaction from you concerning them; and on the other, that he doth not apprehend them so deeply, as in respect of them to refuse to treat of peace, if other things may go hand in hand. As for the war of Naples and the design against the Turk; the King hath commanded me expressly to say, that he doth wish with all his heart to his good brother the French King, that his fortunes may succeed according to his hopes and honourable intentions: and whensoever he shall hear that he is prepared for Grecia, — as your master is pleased now to say that he beggeth a peace of the King, so the King then will beg of him a part in that war. But now, my lords ambassadors, I am to propound unto you somewhat on the King's part. The King your master hath taught our King what to say and demand. You say (my lord Prior) that your King is resolved to recover his right to Naples, wrongfully detained from him; and that if he should not thus do, he could not acquit his honour, nor answer it to his

[1] *i. e.* had begun by appealing, &c. *Si Burgundiæ subditi a principio per viam supplicationis vestrum regem appellassent ut dominum supremum.*

people. Think my lords that the King our master saith the same thing over again to you, touching Normandy, Guienne, Anjou; yea and the kingdom of France itself. I cannot express it better than in your own words. If therefore the French King shall consent that the King our master's title to France (or least tribute for the same) be handled in the treaty, the King is content to go on with the rest, otherwise he refuseth to treat."

The ambassadors being somewhat abashed with this demand, answered in some heat, that they doubted not but that the King their sovereign's sword would be able to maintain his sceptre; and they assured themselves he neither could nor would yield to any diminution of the crown of France, either in territory or regality. But howsoever, they were too great matters for them to speak of, having no commission. It was replied that the King looked for no other answer from them, but would forthwith send his own ambassadors to the French King. There was a question also asked at the table:[1] Whether the French King would agree to have the disposing of the marriage of Brittaine, with an exception and exclusion that he should not marry her himself? To which the ambassadors answered, that it was so far out of their King's thoughts as they had received no instructions touching the same. Thus were the ambassadors dismissed, all save the Prior; and were followed immediately by Thomas Earl of Ormond, and Thomas Goldenston Prior of Christ-Church in Canterbury, who were presently sent over into France. In the

[1] *Injecta autem tanquam obiter est questio a quibusdam ex consiliariis.*

mean space Lionel Bishop of Concordia was sent as nuncio from Pope Alexander the Sixth[1] to both Kings, to move a peace between them. For Pope Alexander, finding himself pent and locked up by a league and association of the principal states of Italy, that he could not make his way for the advancement of his own house (which he immoderately thirsted after), was desirous to trouble the waters in Italy, that he might fish the better; casting the net not out of St. Peter's, but out of Borgia's bark. And doubting lest the fears from England might stay the French King's voyage into Italy, dispatched this bishop to compose all matters between the two Kings, if he could: who first repaired to the French King, and finding him well inclined (as he conceived), took on his journey towards England, and found the English ambassadors at Calais on their way towards the French King. After some conference with them, he was in honourable manner transported over into England, where he had audience of the King. But notwithstanding he had a good ominous name to have made a peace, nothing followed. For in the mean

[1] So Polydore; who adds, "*qui Innocentio paullo ante mortuo successerat.*" But Pope Innocent died on the 25th of July, 1492. Pope Alexander was elected on the 11th, and crowned on the 26th, of the following month. Now Charles VIII. had been married to the Duchess of Brittany in the preceding December; and on the 9th of September immediately following, Henry was on his way to France at the head of an invading army. Therefore if any legate from *Pope Alexander* met at Calais any ambassadors from Henry VII., it must have been those who were arranging the treaty of Estaples, and not those who are spoken of here. But there can be little doubt that the mistake is only as to the Pope, and that some such conference did take place between the legate from *Pope Innocent*, who arrived in England soon after Mid-Lent in 1490, and the ambassadors who were on their way from London to Paris in the beginning of March. See note 1. p. 157.

time the purpose of the French King to marry the Duchess could be no longer dissembled. Wherefore the English ambassadors (finding how things went) took their leave and returned. And the Prior also was warned from hence, to depart out of England. Who when he turned his back, (more like a pedant than an ambassador) dispersed a bitter libel in Latin verse[1] against the King; unto which the King (though he had nothing of a pedant) yet was content to cause an answer to be made in like verse; and that as speaking in his own person; but in a stile of scorn and sport.[2]

About this time also was born the King's second son Henry,[3] who afterwards reigned. And soon after followed the solemnisation of the marriage between Charles and Anne Duchess of Brittaine,[4] with whom he received the duchy of Brittaine as her dowry; the daughter of Maximilian being a little before sent

[1] Bernard André (who seems to be the authority for this) quotes only the first line of Gaguin's poem. Several pens seem to have flown into the ink to answer him; and if the report of the answerers may be trusted, his discomfiture was complete.

There is in the British Museum a little book (*Disceptatio R. Gaguin et J. Phinipbelingi super raptu Ducissæ Britannicæ*, 4to. 1492) containing a war of the same kind in verse and prose between the same Prior and one of Maximilian's chief counsellors, relating to the next stage in this same transaction, — the French King's marriage to Maximilian's bride. One of them, I forget which, commences the war with a Sapphic ode, clenched with a page or two of invective in Latin prose. The other answers in the same form and strain. Both write vigorously, and seem quite in earnest.

[2] *Magno tamen cum vilipendio Prioris, cujus genio et petulantia tanquam facetiis scurræ se oblectabat.*

[3] He was born (according to Stowe) on the 22nd of June, 1491: which shows that Bacon supposed these negotiations to have taken place in the spring of that year; not the spring of 1490, which is the true date.

[4] They were married at the castle of Langeais, in Touraine, on the 6th of December, 1491. Daru, vol. iii. p. 175.

home. Which when it came to the ears of Maximilian (who would never believe it till it was done, being ever the principal in deceiving himself; though in this the French King did very handsomely second it) and tumbling it over and over in his thoughts, that he should at one blow (with such a double scorn) be defeated both of the marriage of his daughter and his own (upon both which he had fixed high imaginations), he lost all patience; and casting off the respects fit to be continued between great Kings (even when their blood is hottest and most risen), fell to bitter invectives against the person and actions of the French King; and (by how much he was the less able to do, talking so much the more) spake all the injuries he could devise of Charles; saying that he was the most perfidious man upon the earth; and that he had made a marriage compounded between an advoultry and a rape; which was done (he said) by the just judgment of God to the end that (the nullity thereof being so apparent to all the world) the race of so unworthy a person might not reign in France. And forthwith he sent ambassadors[1] as well

[1] The correction of one material date generally makes it necessary to readjust all the rest. Bacon, supposing that Henry's final breach with France was not till the spring or summer of 1491, and that the marriage of Charles and Anne followed soon after, took this embassy of Maximilian's for the next act; following immediately upon the marriage. But when we find that between the breach and the marriage there was an interval of at least a year and a half, the question arises what were Henry and Maximilian doing all that time? or how came they to let Charles pursue his designs upon the Duchess so long unmolested? Upon closer examination, with the help of Rymer and other modern lights, it will appear I think that the story requires a good deal of correction. And Polydore Vergil's narrative supplies — not indeed the true story — but a hint from which the true story may be collected. He says that Maximilian, when his daughter (who was betrothed to Charles) was sent back to him,

to the King of England as to the King of Spain, to incite them to war and to treat a league offensive

began to suspect Charles's design upon the Duchess; — that thereupon he sent one James Contibald to Henry, to propose that they should join their forces against Charles; himself engaging to contribute not less than 10,000 men for two years, and as soon as he should be ready for the war to let Henry know, giving him six months for preparation: — that Henry, who felt that the case of Brittany would not bear any longer delay, and who was already of his own motion raising forces for her defence, was delighted with this message, and promised that Maximilian should not find him unprepared: — that in the mean time (that is, as I understand it, while the arrangement between Henry and Maximilian stood thus), Charles married Anne and so carried off Duchy and Duchess together: — that Maximilian, as soon as the first burst of his rage was over, concluding that something must be done for the reparation of his honour, warned Henry to prepare for war with France with all speed, for he should soon be ready: — that Henry, in reliance upon this promise, immediately levied a great army and sent word that he was ready and would put to sea as soon as he heard that Maximilian was ready too: — that his messengers found Maximilian totally unprepared: — that their report to that effect, being quite unexpected, threw him into great perplexity, for he feared that the war would be too much for him if he undertook it alone, and that the people would reproach and calumniate him if he declined it: — but that weighing the honour against the danger, he resolved for honour; made up his mind to attack France single-handed; raised fresh forces, and keeping Maximilian's defection a secret from his troops lest it should dispirit them, set out for Calais (for at last we come to a date) *VIII. Iduum Septembris*, — the 6th of September.

Now since there is no hint here of any concurrent embassy to *Spain*, we may very well suppose that Contibald's business was not the negotiation of that triple league between Maximilian, Henry, and Ferdinand, which held so important a place in Henry's policy; but some separate arrangement in which Maximilian and Henry were concerned alone. And since it is represented as occurring certainly *before* the marriage, and may for anything that is said to the contrary have occurred a good while before, — if we find traces of any such arrangement at any time within the preceding half year, and the circumstances seem otherwise to suit, we need not reject it on account of the date. Now such a separate arrangement was (it seems) concluded between Henry and Maximilian about the end of May, 1491; and this I suspect was really the business of the mission which Polydore speaks of; though Polydore, mistaking the date, connected and confounded it with other matters of like nature that happened after.

The arrangement to which I allude (my information comes chiefly from

against France, promising to concur with great forces of his own. Hereupon the King of England (going

Lobineau, i. p. 813, 4, who seems to have studied D'Argentré carefully) appears to have been no part of the great convention between Maximilian, Henry, and Ferdinand, for a joint invasion of France; which was in force indeed at the time, but did not provide for such speedy action as the present accident seemed to require. That convention had been concluded in September, 1490; a date considerably earlier than Bacon would have assigned, but agreeing perfectly well with his theory of Henry's policy; for it would seem from that that Henry had taken care, *before* he finally broke with France, to provide himself with those occasions, first for making the show of war and then for accepting terms of peace, which Bacon detected in the broad outlines of the case, through all Polydore's errors of detail. Already it seems he had engaged Maximilian and Ferdinand to take their part in a combined movement against Charles; which if they performed, he would have power to command what terms of peace he pleased; if not, he would have a fair excuse for accepting such terms as he could get. The seed thus timely sown came prosperously to harvest at last in the treaty of Estaples, as we shall see; but that was not till the end of 1492.

Charles in the mean time, unwilling to provoke a combined attack from so formidable a confederacy, forbore to renew his suspended hostilities against Brittany, and applied himself entirely to win the Duchess by peaceful arts from her engagement to Maximilian. The Duchess however, encouraged no doubt by these great alliances, stood well out against his suit; and at length (by way perhaps of ending it at once) assumed publicly the title of Queen of the Romans. This was in March, 1490–1, at which time D'Argentré (xiii. 57.) supposes Charles to have just discovered the marriage. So decisive a step stirred him to take stronger measures, and at the same time gave him an ally in D'Albret, an old aspirant to the Duchess's hand whose hopes it extinguished. By this man's means he made himself master of the important town of Nantes; a town which in the beginning of the war, it will be remembered, he had attempted in vain to take; which in the summer of 1490 he had again (it would seem) invested (see Rymer, 12 June, 1490); and which was now on the 19th of February, 1490–1, delivered into the hands of the French. Charles himself entered it on the *4th of April*, 1491. Upon the news of this, Maximilian, alarmed and roused in his turn, got his father the Emperor to call a Diet (une Diette des Estates d'Allemagne), who voted him a force of 12,000 lanzknechts. They were to be sent to the succour of the Duchess in August, and *to be joined by* 6000 *English*. This I take to have been the occasion and business of the mission of which Polydore speaks. And since it is certain that ambassadors were despatched from Brittany on the 24th of May, 1491, as from the King and Queen of the Romans, to solicit succour from Henry; and that James Contibald (or Gondebault) was in

nevertheless his own way) called a Parliament, it being the seventh year of his reign;[1] and the first day

England about the same time negotiating on the part of Maximilian concerning the repayment of expences incurred in the affairs of Brittany; that would seem to be the most probable date of it: a date of some consequence in connexion with Henry's next proceeding; concerning which I have a doubt to raise and settle.

The arrangement, whatever it was, was ineffectual. It is said that some succours were sent from England (forces were certainly *raised* there in April and May, 1491; see Cal. Pat. Rolls, pp. 37. 63. 71. 70.), but not enough to do any good by themselves; that for Maximilian's lanzknechts, Charles strengthened his frontiers against their passage and kept them from joining, while he proceeded to take Guincamp; and that the Duchess, seeing her towns going and no succour coming, and that whether she made her appeal against Charles to arms or to arbitration, he was obviously in a condition to defeat her either way, — at length despaired of resistance, and consented to compound the quarrel by becoming Queen of France and merging her duchy in her crown.

[1] The only Parliament that was held in Henry's seventh year met on the 17th October, 1491. It could not therefore have been called in consequence of the marriage, which had not yet taken place. This however, considering the doubt and confusion in which all the events and dates of these transactions are involved, would be of no great consequence. The intentions of the French King to possess himself of Brittany by one means or another must have been sufficiently known before October, and would be ground enough for calling a war-parliament.

But there is another difficulty which is not so easily explained. Nothing can be more distinct and positive than Polydore Vergil's statement that the exaction of the *benevolence* was subsequent to the meeting of this assembly, and in fact sanctioned by it. "Convocato principum concilio, primum exponit causas belli sumendi contra Francos; *deinde eos poscit pro bello pecuniam.* Causas belli cuncti generatim probant, *suamque operam pro se quisque offert.* Rex, collaudatâ suorum virtute, ut populus tributo non gravaretur, cui gratificandum existimabat, voluit molliter ac leniter pecuniam a locupletioribus *per benevolentiam* exigere. Fuit id exactionis genus," &c. Of which the corresponding passage in Stowe may serve for a translation. He "called a Parliament, and therein declared that he was justly provoked to make war against the Frenchmen, *and therefore desired them of their benevolence of money* and men towards the maintenance thereof. Every man allowed the cause to be just, and *promised his helping hand.* And to the intent he might spare the poorer sort he thought good first to exact money of the richest sort *by way of a benevolence,* which kind of levying of money was first practised," &c. Nothing on the other hand can be more certain than that the commissions for the

of opening thereof (sitting under his cloth of estate) spake himself unto his Lords and Commons in this manner.

benevolence were issued more than three months before the Parliament met; and that the supplies which were voted by the Parliament when it did meet were not in the form of a benevolence, but an ordinary tax of two fifteenths and tenths. We have here therefore a substantial inaccuracy of some kind, which cannot be set right by shifting a date or correcting a careless expression. The revival of this exaction was an important matter. Polydore's next words show that he knew what it meant; and he could not have overlooked the importance of the question whether it was done before or after a Parliament,—with or without a Parliamentary sanction.

I am persuaded that the error lies deeper; that, as the case was nearly the same as that of 1488, so the error is exactly the same as that which I have pointed out in note 3, p. 114. I am persuaded that Polydore, on this as on that occasion, mistook a *Great Council* for a Parliament; that Henry, on this occasion as on that, before he called a regular Parliament took the precaution of calling one of these quasi-parliaments; with a view partly to ascertain the sense of the people and partly to engage them in the cause before he engaged himself: and that it was to a Great Council held in June, 1491, or thereabouts, that he now declared his intention to invade France, at the same time asking their advice as to the raising of supplies.

For the grounds of this conclusion and for an answer to objections, I must again refer to the appendix. If I am right, the fact and the date will be found to be of some value, both as clearing the narrative and as illustrating Henry's character and policy. It will be seen that when the French King took possession of Nantes and was obviously proceeding to absorb Brittany either by arms or by marriage or by arbitration; and when Maximilian was about to raise a force of 12,000 men to oppose him, and called upon Henry to join; which was as I suppose in April or May, 1491; Henry had a good case to go to his people with. Having first therefore spread an alarm of French invasion (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 5 May, p. 71.), and made some stir of warlike preparation to warm the blood and feel the pulse of the people, he proceeded in the same course which had succeeded so well in 1488; and immediately summoned — not his Parliament, which could not perhaps have been assembled so expeditiously as the time required — but a Great Council, which he could make as fair a representative of a Parliament as he pleased, and which, though it had no power to make laws or impose taxes, yet served very well both to express and react upon the public opinion of the time. Finding them in an apt humour, and having all his precautions ready taken, he boldly announced his intention of making an invasive war upon France, and thereupon (pretending probably the urgency of the occasion, which could not wait for the ordi-

"My Lords and you the Commons; when I purposed to make a war in Brittaine by my lieutenant, I

nary course,) obtained their advice and consent (which though it carried no legal authority would in a popular cause carry authority enough for the purpose) to send out commissioners to levy a "benevolence." A commission "de subsidio requirendo pro viagio Franciæ" was accordingly issued (7th July, 1491); by which, after a preamble declaring the grounds of the intended war, which it represents as undertaken, not "de advisamento concilii nostri," but "ad instantiam et specialem requisitionem tam dominorum spiritualium et temporalium *quam aliorum nobilium*," the requisite authority was conveyed to a number of persons, each to act within a specified county. But as these Great Councils could only give advice and such authority as the opinion and personal influence of the members carried with it, Henry seems to have used them only as preparatory to regular Parliaments. A regular Parliament was accordingly summoned shortly after, which (in consideration probably of the succours to Brittany, upon which the benevolence money must have been partly consumed, and also of its more distressed state and more imminent danger), voted fresh supplies, but to be raised by ordinary taxation; and passed the laws which were convenient for a state of war.

If we suppose therefore the speech which follows to have been addressed to a Great Council in June, 1491; the benevolence to have been levied, with their advice, in July and August; some succours to have been sent to Brittany about the same time; and the Parliament to have met on the 17th of October; we shall have supplied all the correction which (so far as I know) Bacon's narrative requires; and we shall find that his interpretation of Henry's views and policy and character is illustrated and confirmed by the change.

It may be worth mentioning, as a confirmation of this conjecture, that whereas Bacon expressly represents the King as making the declaration in person, it does not appear from the Parliament Rolls that he did open in person the session of October, 1491. Bacon is not likely, I think, to have stated it so expressly, if it were only an inference from Polydore's expression "exponit causas," &c. It is more likely that he had some fuller account of the speech itself. And it need not be thought that the same account would have enabled him to correct the error. It may on the contrary have authorised and established it. Of such a declaration as this there would no doubt at the time be many copies or abstracts circulated. At the time, "His Majesty's Speech" would be description quite sufficient. One of these happened perhaps to be preserved. A collector coming into possession of it, and wanting to know in what department of his collection it should be put, fixed the year at once from the circumstances. It was plainly a declaration of war with France, about the time when Brittany was absorbed into the French monarchy. Then he turned to his Poly-

made declaration thereof to you by my Chancellor. But now that I mean to make a war upon France in person, I will declare it to you myself. That war was to defend another man's right, but this is to recover our own; and that ended by accident, but we hope this shall end in victory.

"The French King troubles the Christian world. That which he hath is not his own, and yet he seeketh more. He hath invested himself of Brittaine.[1] He maintaineth the rebels in Flanders: and he threateneth Italy. For ourselves, he hath proceeded from dissimulation to neglect, and from neglect to contumely. He hath assailed our confederates: he denieth our tribute: in a word, he seeks war. So did not his father; but sought peace at our hands; and so perhaps will he, when good counsel or time shall make him see as much as his father did.

"Meanwhile, let us make his ambition our advantage, and let us not stand upon a few crowns of tribute or acknowledgement, but by the favour of Almighty God try our right for the crown of France itself; remembering that there hath been a French King prisoner in England, and a King of England crowned in France. Our confederates are not diminished. Burgundy is in a mightier hand than ever, and never more provoked. Brittaine cannot help us, but it may hurt them. New acquests are more burden than strength. The malcontents of his own king-

dore, or Hall, or Holinshed, or Stowe, found this passage, and wrote on the back "The Speech of K. Henry 7, at the opening of the Parliament in 1491;" which would seem to be authority sufficient for stating that Henry opened the session in person.

[1] So Ed. 1622. The MS. has "he hath invested Brittaine."

dom have not been base populace[1] nor titulary impostors; but of an higher nature. The King of Spain (doubt ye not) will join with us, not knowing where the French King's ambition will stay. Our holy father (the Pope) likes no Tramontanes in Italy. But howsoever it be, this matter of confederates is rather to be thought on than reckoned on; for God forbid but England should be able to get reason of France without a second.

"At the battles of Cressy, Poictiers, Agent-Court, we were of ourselves. France hath much people, and few soldiers: they have no stable bands of foot. Some good horse they have, but those are forces which are least fit for a defensive war, where the actions are in the assailant's choice. It was our discords only that lost France; and (by the power of God) it is the good peace which we now enjoy that will recover it. God hath hitherto blessed my sword. I have in this time that I have reigned, weeded out my bad subjects, and tried my good. My people and I know one another; which breeds confidence. And if there should be any bad blood left in the kingdom, an honourable foreign war will vent it or purify it. In this great business let me have your advice and aid. If any of you were to make his son knight, you might have aid of your tenants by law. This concerns the knighthood and spurs of the kingdom, whereof I am father; and bound not only to seek to maintain it, but to advance it. But for matter of treasure let it not be taken from the poorest sort, but from those to whom

[1] The Ed. of 1622 has "base, popular." In the MS. it seems to have been first written "populare," but the *r* has plainly been corrected into a *c*.

the benefit of the war may redound. France is no wilderness, and I that profess good husbandry hope to make the war (after the beginnings) to pay itself. Go together in God's name, and lose no time, for I have called this Parliament wholly for this cause."

Thus spake the King. But for all this, though he shewed great forwardness for a war, not only to his Parliament and court, but to his privy counsel likewise (except the two bishops and a few more), yet nevertheless in his secret intentions he had no purpose to go through with any war upon France. But the truth was, that he did but traffic with that war, to make his return in money. He knew well that France was now entire and at unity with itself, and never so mighty many years before. He saw by the taste he[1] had of his forces sent into Brittaine that the French knew well enough how to make war with the English; by not putting things to the hazard of a battle, but wearying[2] them by long sieges of towns, and strong fortified encampings. James the Third of Scotland, his true friend and confederate, gone; and James the Fourth (that had succeeded) wholly at the devotion of France, and ill-affected towards him. As for the conjunctions of Ferdinando of Spain and Maximilian, he could make no foundation upon them. For the one had power and not will; and the other had will and not power. Besides that Ferdinando had but newly taken breath from the war with the Moors; and merchanded at this time with France for the restoring of the counties of Russignon and Perpignian, oppignorated to the French. Neither was he out of fear of the discontents

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "that he."
[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "wearing."

and ill blood within the realm; which having used always to repress and appease in person, he was loth they should find him at a distance beyond sea, and engaged in war. Finding therefore the inconveniencies and difficulties in the prosecution of a war, he cast with himself how to compass two things. The one, how by the declaration and inchoation of a war to make his profit. The other, how to come off from the war with saving of his honour. For profit, it was to be made two ways; upon his subjects for the war, and upon his enemies for the peace; like a good merchant that maketh his gain both upon the commodities exported and imported back again. For the point of honour, wherein he might suffer for giving over the war, he considered well, that as he could not trust upon the aids of Ferdinando and Maximilian for supports of war, so the impuissance of the one, and the double proceeding of the other, lay fair for him for occasions[1] to accept of peace.

These things he did wisely foresee, and did as artificially conduct, whereby all things fell into his lap as he desired.

For as for the Parliament, it presently took fire, being affectionate (of old) to the war of France, and desirous (afresh) to repair the dishonour they thought the King sustained by the loss of Brittaine. Therefore they advised the King (with great alacrity) to undertake the war of France. And although the Parliament consisted of the first and second nobility (together with principal citizens and townsmen),[2] yet

[1] *i. e.* pretexts. *Semper præsto habiturus esset ad pacem excusandam.*

[2] With reference to the question whether this was a Parliament or a *Great* Council, it may be worth while to compare with this description

worthily and justly respecting more the people (whose deputies they were) than their own private persons; and finding, by the Lord Chancellor's speech,[1] the King's inclination that way; they consented that commissioners should go forth for the gathering and levying of a Benevolence from the more able sort. This tax (called a Benevolence) was devised by Edward the Fourth, for which he sustained much envy. It was abolished by Richard the Third by act of Parliament, to ingratiate himself with the people; and it was now revived by the King; but with consent of Parliament;[2] for so it was not in the time of King Edward the Fourth. But by this way he raised ex-

of it two independent descriptions of what was certainly a Great Council, in the year 1496. "In this yere (says an old city chronicler, Cott. Vitell. A. xvi. p. 161.) the 24th day of Octobre beganne a great counsaill holden at Westmynster by the Kyng and his lords spiritual and temporal, to the which counsaill come certeyn burgesses and merchants of all cities and good townes of England," &c. And in an original privy seal of Hen. VII. (Cott. Tit. B. v. p. 145.), the same council is described as "or grete counseill of lords sprūell and tempēll, of juges, sjaunts in o lawe and others sōm hede-wisemen of evy citie and good towne of this or lond." Bacon's *description* therefore applies to either.

[1] This seems to be a slip of the memory; for though it was usual for the Lord Chancellor to speak after the King, the allusion is apparently to the last part of the King's own speech. The Latin translation has *Quin et regis moniti memores, in hoc consenserunt, ut contributio (quam benevolentiam appellabant) ab opulentioribus tantum exigeretur.*

[2] Hume observed (on a comparison of dates) that this was a mistake. I have already explained at length my own opinion as to the nature of the mistake and how it arose. If that explanation should be rejected, it may be accounted for another way. The commissions for the levying of the benevolence, though the great body of them bear date the 7th July, 1491, did not *all* bear that date. There is a commission given in Rymer, dated 6th December, 1491, which is in the same words precisely. Any one who had happened to meet with the last and not with any others would have set it down as fixing the date of the levy of the benevolence beyond all question. It may be observed that this benevolence received a kind of sanction from a subsequent Parliament; an act being passed in 1495 to enforce the payment of sums which had been promised. See p. 241.

ceeding great sums. Insomuch as the city of London (in those days)[1] contributed nine thousand pounds and better; and that chiefly levied upon the wealthier sort. There is a tradition of a *dilemma* that Bishop Morton (the Chancellor) used, to raise up the Benevolence to higher rates; and some called it his fork, and some his crotch. For he had couched an article in the instructions to the commissioners who were to levy the Benevolence, That if they met with any that were sparing, they should tell them that they must needs have, because they laid up; and if they were spenders, they must needs have, because it was seen in their port and manner of living; so neither kind came amiss.

This Parliament was merely a Parliament of war; for it was in substance but a declaration of war against France and Scotland,[2] with some statutes con-

[1] *i. e.* even in those days; when money was so much scarcer. *Etiam illa ætate.*

[2] The declaration of war against *Scotland*, of which no mention is made in our modern histories, is contained in the preamble to the act (7 H. 7. c. 6.), by which all Scots, not made denizens, were ordered out of the kingdom within forty days. "The King," it says, "our Sovereign Lord, hath had to his great cost and charge many assemblies and communications with the King of Scots for amity truce and peace to be had and observed betwixt his Highness and his subjects on the one part, and the King of Scots and his subjects on the other part; but what accord or agreement soever be taken or concluded, such accord or agreement on the part of the said King of Scots is ever under the surest promise broken and not kept; for the which it is better to be with them at open war than under such a feigned peace: wherefore," &c.

I suppose the measure may be regarded as one partly of precaution and partly of menace; the object being to induce the Scotch King to renew the truce, which for some reason or other he seems to have been reluctant to do. The truce between England and Scotland which had been confirmed at Westminster on the 24th of October, 1488 (See Rot. Scot. ii. p. 488.), expired on the 5th of October, 1491. For some time before, the two kings had been on terms of mutual distrust and secret hostility. Henry had been secretly encouraging some of James's disaf-

ducing thereunto; as the severe punishing of mortpays and keeping back soldiers' wages in captains; the like severity for the departure of soldiers without licence; strengthening of the common law in favour of protections for those that were in the King's service;[1] and the setting the gate open and wide, for men to sell or mortgage their lands without fines for alienation,[2] to furnish themselves with money for the

fected subjects in a design to possess themselves of his person and deliver it into his hands;—a design however which was probably not to be executed till after the expiration of the truce upon failure of the negotiations for renewing it. James had been secretly negotiating with the Duchess of Burgundy and Perkin Warbeck, and is supposed (see Tytler, iv. p. 361.) to have made up his mind to break with England as soon as he durst. Which of the two had the justest ground of complaint it would not be easy to ascertain: but it is clear that neither of them could have felt secure that the other would not take against him the first advantage that offered; and it was necessary for Henry, on entering into a war with France, to make himself safe on the Scotch side. He was now well furnished with money and with troops, and well seconded by his people, and therefore in a good condition to treat. (It was partly with this view probably that he commenced his preparations for the French invasion so long before the time.) Commissioners had been appointed in April and again in June, both to settle complaints concerning breaches of the existing truce and to treat for the prolongation of it; but nothing seems to have been concluded. Immediately upon its expiration followed the declaration of war, which had better success: for new commissioners being presently sent by Henry (22nd of October) on the same errand, they were met by commissioners on the other side, and on the 21st of December following a new truce was agreed upon between them, which was to last for five years. Henry ratified it at once (9th of January, 1491-2); but James, it seems, demurred; and a truce for nine months only was in the end concluded. It was to commence on the 20th of February and last till the 20th November, 1492: and was ratified by James on the 18th of March. See Rymer.

[1] 7 H. 7. c. 1, 2. *Veluti circa severam animadversionem in capitaneos qui aut stipendia militum mortuorum vel absentium in rationes suas referrent, aut etiam stipendia militum detinerent. Severe etiam sancitum est contra milites qui post delectum habitum sine licentia se substraherent. Etiam protectiones quæ prius lege communi in usu erant pro iis qui militabant, statuto roboratæ sunt.*

[2] Thereby releasing them from the charges which were due to the crown in that case: *ne aliquid inde pro eorum alienationibus regi solverent.*

war; and lastly the voiding of all Scotchmen out of England.

There was also a statute for the dispersing of the standard of the exchequer throughout England, thereby to size weights and measures;[1] and two or three more of less importance.

After the Parliament was broken up (which lasted not long) the King went on with his preparations for the war of France; yet neglected not in the mean time the affairs of Maximilian, for the quieting of Flanders and restoring him to his authority amongst his subjects. For at that time the Lord of Ravenstein, being not only a subject rebelled but a servant revolted (and so much the more malicious and violent), by the aid of Bruges and Gaunt had taken the town and both the castles of Sluice (as we said before); and having by the commodity of the haven gotten together certain ships and barks, fell to a kind of piratical trade; robbing and spoiling and taking prisoners the ships and vessels of all nations that passed alongst that coast towards the mart of Antwerp, or into any part of Brabant, Zealand, or Friezeland; being ever well victualled from Picardy, besides the commodity of victuals from Sluice and the country adjacent, and the avails of his own prizes. The French assisted him still under-hand; and he likewise (as all men do that have been on both sides) thought himself not safe, except he depended upon a third person. There was a small town some two miles from Bruges towards the sea, called

[1] 7 H. 7. c. 3. *Ut exemplar ponderum et mensurarum quod in scacchario regis ut authenticum repositum est, in universum regnum dispergeretur; et pondera atque mensuræ ubique ad eam normam examinarentur et reducerentur.*

Dam; which was a fort and approach to Bruges, and had a relation also to Sluice. This town the King of the Romans had attempted often (not for any worth of the town in itself, but because it might choke Bruges, and cut it off from the sea); and ever failed. But therewith the Duke of Saxony came down into Flanders, taking upon him the person of an umpire, to compose things between Maximilian and his subjects; but being (indeed) fast and assured to Maximilian. Upon this pretext of neutrality and treaty, he repaired to Bruges, desiring of the states of Bruges to enter peaceably into their town, with a retinue of some number of men of arms fit for his estate, being somewhat the more (as he said) the better to guard him in a country that was up in arms; and bearing them in hand that he was to communicate with them of divers matters of great importance for their good; which having obtained of them, he sent his carriages and harbingers before him to provide his lodging; so that his men of war entered the city in good array, but in peaceable manner,[1] and he followed. They that went before inquired still for inns and lodgings, as if they would have rested there all night; and so went on till they came to the gate that leadeth directly towards Dam; and they of Bruges only gazed upon them, and gave them passage. The captains and inhabitants of Dam also suspected no harm from any that passed through Bruges; and discovering forces afar off, supposed they had been some succours that were come from their friends, knowing some dangers towards them: and so per-

[1] This clause is omitted in the translation.

ceiving nothing but well till it was too late, suffered them to enter their town. By which kind of slight, rather than stratagem, the town of Dam was taken, and the town of Bruges shrewdly blocked up, whereby they took great discouragement. The Duke of Saxony, having won the town of Dam, sent immediately to the King[1] to let him know that it was Sluice chiefly and the Lord Ravenstein that kept the rebellion of Flanders in life; and that if it pleased the King to besiege it by sea, he also would besiege it by land, and so cut out the core of those wars. The King, willing to uphold the authority of Maximilian (the better to hold France in awe),[2] and being likewise sued unto by his merchants, for that the seas were much infested by the barks of the Lord Ravenstein, sent straightways Sir Edward Poynings,[3] a valiant man and of good service, with twelve ships, well furnished with soldiers and artillery, to clear the seas, and to besiege Sluice on that part. The Englishmen did not only coop up the Lord Ravenstein, that he stirred not, and likewise hold in strait siege the maritime part of the town, but also assailed one of the castles, and renewed the assault so for twenty days' space (issuing still out of their ships at the ebb), as they made great slaughter of them of the castle, who continually fought with them to repulse them; though of the English part also were slain a brother of

[1] *i. e.* to King Henry. The Latin has *Henricum Regem.*

[2] *Ut fræno Galliæ esset.* Maximilian's territory, lying along the north-eastern border of France, not only checked her encroachments on that side, but could be used to effect a diversion and so prevent her from concentrating her forces elsewhere: as we have seen in the case of Brittany in 1489.

[3] This according to Rapin (whose dates however are not to be too much trusted) was in the middle of 1492.

the Earl of Oxford's, and some fifty more. But the siege still continuing more and more strait; and both the castles (which were the principal strength of the town) being distressed, the one by the Duke of Saxony, and the other by the English; and a bridge of boats, which the Lord Ravenstein had made between both castles, whereby succours and relief might pass from the one to the other, being on a night set on fire by the English; he despairing to hold the town, yielded (at the last) the castles to the English, and the town to the Duke of Saxony, by composition. Which done, the Duke of Saxony and Sir Edward Poynings treated with them of Bruges to submit themselves to Maximilian their lord; which after some time they did, paying (in some good part) the charge of the war, whereby the Almains and foreign succours were dismissed. The example of Bruges other of the revolted towns followed; so that Maximilian grew to be out of danger, but (as his manner was to handle matters) never out of necessity. And Sir Edward Poynings (after he had continued at Sluice some good while till all things were settled) returned unto the King, being then before Bulloigne.[1]

Somewhat about this time[2] came letters from Ferdinando and Isabella, King and Queen of Spain, signifying the final conquest of Granada from the Moors; which action, in itself so worthy, King Ferdinando (whose manner was never to lose any virtue for the

[1] Sometime, therefore, between the 19th of October and the 7th or 8th of November, 1492.

[2] Earlier, if Rapin's date does not put the expedition of Sir Edward Poinings too late. The solemnity in St. Paul's was on the 6th of April, 1492. See old Chron. (Cott. Vitel. A. xvi. p. 161.).

shewing) had expressed and displayed in his letters at large; with all the particularities and religious punctos and ceremonies, that were observed in the reception of that city and kingdom:[1] shewing amongst other things, that the King would not by any means in person enter the city, until he had first aloof seen the cross set up upon the greater tower of Granada, whereby it became Christian ground: that likewise before he would enter he did homage to God above, pronouncing by an herald from the height of that tower, that he did acknowledge to have recovered that kingdom by the help of God Almighty, and the glorious Virgin, and the virtuous Apostle Saint James, and the holy father Innocent the Eighth, together with the aids and services of his prelates, nobles, and commons: that yet he stirred not from his camp, till he had seen a little army of martyrs, to the number of seven hundred and more Christians (that had lived in bonds and servitude as slaves[2] to the Moors), pass before his eyes, singing a psalm for their redemption; and that he had given tribute unto God, by alms and relief extended to them all, for his admission into the city. These things were in the letters, with many more ceremonies of a kind of holy ostentation. The King, ever willing to put himself into the consort or quire of all religious actions, and naturally affecting much the King of Spain (as far as one King can affect another), partly for his virtue and partly for a counterpoise to France; upon the receipt of these letters sent all his nobles and prelates that were about the court,[3]

[1] *Ejus regni.*
[2] The translation has *crudelissimâ servitute.*
[3] The translation has *urbem et aulam.*

together with the mayor and aldermen of London, in great solemnity to the Church of Paul's; there to hear a declaration from the Lord Chancellor, now Cardinal. When they were assembled, the Cardinal, standing upon the uppermost step or half-pace before the quire, and all the nobles, prelates, and governors of the City at the foot of the stairs, made a speech to them; letting them know, that they were assembled[1] in that consecrated place to sing unto God a new song. For that (said he) these many years the Christians have not gained new ground or territory upon the Infidels,[2] nor enlarged and set further the bounds of the Christian world. But this is now done by the prowess and devotion of Ferdinando and Isabella, Kings of Spain; who have to their immortal honour recovered the great and rich kingdom of Granada and the populous and mighty city of the same name from the Moors,[3] having been in possession thereof by the space of seven hundred years and more; for which this assembly and all Christians are to render all laud and thanks unto God, and to celebrate this noble act of the King of Spain, who in this is not only victorious but apostolical, in the gaining of new provinces to the Christian faith; and the rather for that this victory and conquest is obtained without much effusion of blood; whereby it is to be hoped that there shall be gained not only new territory, but infinite souls to the church of Christ; whom the Almighty (as it seems) would have live to be converted. Herewithal he did relate some of the most memorable particulars of the war and victory. And after his speech ended,

[1] *Ex regis mandato convenisse.*
[2] *Saracenis et Mahumetanis.*
[3] *A Saracenis.*

the whole assembly went solemnly in procession, and *Te Deum* was sung.

Immediately after the solemnity,[1] the King kept his May-day of his palace at Shine (now Richmond); where to warm the blood of his nobility and gallants against the war, he kept great triumphs of justing and tourney during all that month. In which space it so fell out, that Sir James Parker and Hugh Vaughan one of the King's gentlemen ushers, having had a controversy touching certain arms that the King-at-Arms had given Vaughan, were appointed to run some courses one against another; and by accident of a faulty helmet that Parker had on, he was stricken into the mouth at the first course, so that his tongue was borne unto the hinder part of his head, in such sort that he died presently upon the place; which because of the controversy precedent, and the death that followed, was accounted amongst the vulgar as a combat or trial of right.

The King towards the end of this summer, having put his forces wherewith he meant to invade France in readiness (but so as they were not yet met or mustered together), sent Urswick, now made his almoner, and Sir John Risley to Maximilian, to let him know that he was in arms, ready to pass the seas into France, and did but expect to hear from him when and where he did appoint to join with him, according to his promise made unto him by Countebalt his ambassador.

The English ambassadors having repaired to Maximilian did find his power and promise at a very great distance; he being utterly unprovided of men, money, and arms, for any such enterprise. For Maximilian

[1] *Non multis diebus ab hac solemnitate.*

having neither wing to fly on, for that his patrimony of Austria was not in his hands (his father being then living), and on the other side his matrimonial territories of Flanders were[1] partly in dower to his mother-in-law, and partly not serviceable in respect of the late rebellions,[2] was thereby destitute of means to enter into war. The ambassadors saw this well, but wisely thought fit to advertise the King thereof, rather than to return themselves, till the King's further pleasure were known: the rather, for that Maximilian himself spake as great as ever he did before, and entertained them with dilatory answers; so as the formal part of their ambassage might well warrant and require their further stay. The King hereupon, who doubted as much before, and saw through his business from the beginning, wrote back to the ambassadors, commending their discretion in not returning, and willing them to keep the state wherein they found Maximilian as a secret, till they heard further from him; and meanwhile went on with his voyage royal for France; suppressing for a time this advertisement touching Maximilian's poverty and disability.

By this time was drawn together a great and puissant army unto the City of London; in which were Thomas Marquis Dorset, Thomas Earl of Arundel, Thomas Earl of Derby, George Earl of Shrewsbury, Edmond Earl of Suffolk, Edward Earl of Devonshire, George Earl of Kent, the Earl of Essex, Thomas Earl of Ormond, with a great number of barons, knights, and principal gentlemen; and amongst them Richard Thomas, much noted for the brave troops that he brought out of Wales; the army rising in the whole

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "being."
[2] *Recentibus rebellionibus exhausta.*

to the number of five and twenty thousand foot, and sixteen hundred horse; over which the King (constant in his accustomed trust and employment) made Jasper Duke of Bedford and John Earl of Oxford generals under his own person. The ninth of September, in the eighth year of his reign, he departed from Greenwich towards the sea; all men wondering that he took that season (being so near winter) to begin the war, and some thereupon gathering it was a sign that the war would not be long. Nevertheless the King gave out the contrary, thus; That he intending not to make a summer business of it, but a resolute war (without term prefixed) until he had recovered France, it skilled not much when he began it; especially having Calais at his back, where he might winter, if the reason of the war so required. The sixth of October he embarked at Sandwich; and the same day took land at Calais, which was the rendezvous where all his forces were assigned to meet. But in this his journey towards the sea-side (wherein for the cause that we shall now speak of he hovered so much the longer), he had received letters from the Lord Cordes (who the hotter he was against the English in time of war had the more credit in a negotiation of peace, and besides was held a man open and of good faith); in which letters there was made an overture of peace from the French King, with such conditions as were somewhat to the King's taste; but this was carried at the first with wonderful secrecy. The King was no sooner come to Calais, but the calm winds of peace began to blow. For first the English ambassadors returned out of Flanders from Maximilian, and certified the King that he was not to hope for any aid from Maximilian, for that he was

altogether unprovided. His will was good, but he lacked money. And this was made known and spread throughout the army. And although the English were therewithal nothing dismayed, and that it be the manner of soldiers upon bad news to speak the more bravely;[1] yet nevertheless it was a kind of preparative to a peace. Instantly in the neck of this (as the King had laid it) came news that Ferdinando and Isabella, Kings of Spain, had concluded a peace with King Charles, and that Charles had restored unto them the counties of Ruscignon and Perpignian, which formerly were mortgaged by John King of Arragon, Ferdinando's father, unto France, for three hundred thousand crowns: which debt was also upon this peace by Charles clearly released. This came also handsomely to put on the peace, both because so potent a confederate[2] was fallen off, and because it was a fair example of a peace bought; so as the King should not be the sole merchant in this peace. Upon these airs of peace, the King was content that the Bishop of Exeter and the Lord Daubigny (Governor of Calais) should give a meeting unto the Lord Cordes, for the treaty of a peace: but himself nevertheless and his army, the fifteenth of October, removed from Calais, and in four days' march sat him down before Bulloigne.

During this siege of Bulloigne (which continued near a month) there passed no memorable action nor accident of war. Only Sir John Savage, a valiant captain, was slain, riding about the walls of the town to take a view. The town was both well fortified and well manned; yet it was distressed, and ready for an

[1] *Ex malis nuntiis magis fieri alacres et erectos et magnificentius loqui*
[2] *Qualis fuerit Ferdinandus.*

assault; which if it had been given (as was thought) would have cost much blood; but yet the town would have been carried in the end. Meanwhile a peace was concluded by the commissioners, to continue for both the Kings' lives. Where there was no article of importance; being in effect rather a bargain than a treaty. For all things remained as they were, save that there should be paid to the King seven hundred forty-five thousand ducats in present, for his charges in that journey; and five and twenty thousand crowns yearly, for his charges sustained in the aids of the Britons.[1] For which annual, though he had Maximilian bound before for those charges, yet he counted the alteration of the hand as much as the principal debt;[2] and besides it was left somewhat indefinitely[3]

[1] So Speed; quoting the authority partly of Polydore and partly of a MS. Polydore's words are "Summa autem pactionis fœderis fuit, ut Carolus primum solveret bene magnam pecuniæ summam Henrico pro sumptibus in id bellum factis, juxta æstimationem legatorum; deinde in singulos annos millia aureorum vicena quina penderet per aliquot annos pro impensâ ab ipso Henrico factâ in copias quas Britannis auxilio misisset." Speed substituted this specific "745,000 ducats (186,250 pounds English)" to be paid in present, for the *bene magnam pecuniæ summam;* repeating in other respects Polydore's statement.

The old Chronicle, speaking upon the authority of the King's own letter to the City, which was read at Guildhall on the 9th of November, says only that "for to have this peace established the French King granted unto our sovereign lord, to be paid in certain years, 745,000 scutis; which amounteth in sterling money to 127,666*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* And this, it appears from Rymer, is the correct statement. Henry reckoned the expenses incurred in the defence of Brittany (for which the French Queen was bound) at 620,000 crowns (*escus d'or*) and the sum remaining due upon the pension granted to Edward IV. by Lewis XI. at 125,000. He was now to give up his claim to both these sums in consideration of an annual payment by the French King of 50,000 francs, to commence the 1st of May next, and be continued from half year to half year until the whole 745,000 crowns were paid.

[2] *i. e.* worth as much as the whole sum. *Debitoris mutationem non minus quam si debitum ipsum esset persolutum æstimabat.*

[3] Polydore says *per aliquot annos.* And adds "Franci reges postea, bello

when it should determine or expire; which made the English esteem it as a tribute carried under fair terms. And the truth is, it was paid both to the King and to his son Henry the Eighth, longer than it could continue upon any computation of charges. There was also assigned by the French King unto all the King's principal counsellors great pensions, besides rich gifts for the present; which whether the King did permit, to save his own purse from rewards, or to communicate the envy of a business that was displeasing to his people, was diversely interpreted: for certainly the King had no great fancy to own this

Italico implicati, id annuum vectigal etiam Henrico octavo, septimi filio, pependerunt: quo tandem debitam pecuniam persolverent amicitiamque servarent:" which Speed renders thus, "which (by the English called tribute) was duly paid during all this King's reign and also to Henry his son, till the whole debt was run out; thereby to preserve amity with England." *Id vectigal* was the *millia aureorum vicena quina;* which, continued into Henry VIII.'s reign, would have risen at the very least to 425,000 of these *aurei;* making (if they are rightly translated crowns) the whole sum 1,170,000 crowns, or 234,000*l.*: a fact which would have amply justified Bacon's remark, a few lines further on, that the annual payments could not have continued so long "upon any computation of charges." As it was, the continuation of the payments beyond the date of Henry VII.'s death is sufficiently explained. The whole sum of 745,000 crowns was to be paid off by half-yearly instalments of 25,000 francs *in crowns of gold;* each franc worth 20 sols, each crown worth 35 sols; at which rate it would take more than 25 years to pay the whole; 10 years after the death of Henry VII. Bernard André misrepresents the fact, but probably represents the popular opinion in England, in calling it a tribute granted in consideration of our French possessions. "Quocirca (he says) pactionibus utrinque transactis scriptoque solemniter commendatis, *antiquum jus suum sub tributo*, ut alii sui sanguinis antecessores, poposcit; quod quidem gratiocissime a rege Galliæ concessum est."

The half-yearly payments were in fact continued till the year 1514; when in consideration of a new claim made by Henry VIII. as heir to Margaret Duchess of Somerset, which (together with what then remained unpaid of the 745,000 crowns) was estimated at a million crowns, Lewis bound himself to pay that sum by half-yearly instalments of 50,000 francs each. See Rymer, xiii. p. 428.

peace; and therefore a little before it was concluded, he had under-hand procured some of his best captains and men of war to advise him to a peace under their hands, in an earnest manner, in the nature of a supplication. But the truth is, this peace was welcome to both Kings; to Charles, for that it assured unto him the possession of Brittaine, and freed the enterprise of Naples; to Henry, for that it filled his coffers; and that he foresaw at that time a storm of inward troubles coming upon him, which presently after brake forth. But it gave no less discontent to the nobility and principal persons of the army,[1] who had many of them sold or engaged their estates upon the hopes of the war. They stuck not to say, That the King cared not to plume his nobility and people, to feather himself. And some made themselves merry with that the King had said in Parliament; That after the war was once begun, he doubted not but to make it pay it itself; saying he had kept promise.

Having risen from Bulloigne, he went to Calais, where he stayed some time: from whence also he writ letters[2] (which was a courtesy that he sometimes used) to the Mayor of London and the Aldermen his brethren; half bragging what great sums he had obtained for the peace; knowing well that full coffers

[1] In the translation, — remembering probably the supplication of the captains and the men of war, — he adds *utcunque nonnulli ex iis ad ejus nutum se accommodassent.*

[2] They were read at Guildhall on the 9th of November. Old Chron. Vitel. A. xvi. fo. 145. *b.*

This is the treaty which in our modern historians goes by the name of the *treaty of Estaples.* It is worthy of remark that on the Sunday on which it was concluded (3rd November, 1492), the truce with Scotland which was to expire on the 20th of that month, was continued till the 30th of April, 1494. See Rot. Scot. ii. p. 509.

of the King is ever good news to London; and better news it would have been, if their benevolence had been but a loan. And upon the seventeenth of September following he returned to Westminster, where he kept his Christmas.

Soon after the King's return, he sent the Order of the Garter to Alphonso Duke of Calabria, eldest son to Ferdinando King of Naples. An honour sought by that Prince to hold him up in the eyes of the Italians; who expecting the arms of Charles, made great account of the amity of England for a bridle to France. It was received by Alphonso with all the ceremony and pomp that could be devised; as things use to be carried that are intended for opinion. It was sent by Urswick; upon whom the King bestowed this ambassage, to help him after many dry employments.

At this time the King began again to be haunted with sprites; by the magic and curious arts of the Lady Margaret; who raised up the ghost of Richard Duke of York (second son to King Edward the Fourth) to walk and vex the King. This was a finer counterfeit stone than Lambert Symnell; better done, and worn upon greater hands; being graced after with the wearing of a King of France and a King of Scotland, not of a Duchess of Burgundy only. And for Symnell, there was not much in him, more than that he was a handsome boy, and did not shame his robes. But this youth (of whom we are now to speak) was such a mercurial, as the like hath seldom been known; and could make his own part, if any time he chanced to be out. Wherefore this being one of the strangest examples of a personation,

that ever was in elder or later times, it deserveth to be discovered and related at the full: although the King's manner of shewing things by pieces, and dark-lights, hath so muffled it, that it hath left it almost as a mystery to this day.

The Lady Margaret, whom the King's friends called Juno, because she was to him as Juno was to Æneas, stirring both heaven and hell to do him mischief, for a foundation of her particular practices against him did continually by all means possible nourish, maintain, and divulge the flying opinion that Richard Duke of York (second son to Edward the Fourth) was not murdered in the Tower (as was given out) but saved alive; for that those who were employed in that barbarous fact, having destroyed the elder brother, were stricken with remorse and compassion towards the younger, and set him privily at liberty to seek his fortune. This lure she cast abroad, thinking that this fame and belief (together with the fresh example of Lambert Symnell) would draw at one time or other some birds to strike upon it. She used likewise a further diligence, not committing all to chance: for she had some secret espials, (like to the Turks commissioners for children of tribute,[1]) to look abroad for handsome and graceful youths, to make Plantagenets and Dukes of York. At the last she did light on one, in whom all things met, as one would wish, to serve her turn for a counterfeit of Richard Duke of York. This was Perkin Warbeck, whose adventures we shall now describe. For first, the years agreed well. Secondly, he was a youth of

[1] *Turcorum ministris qui puerorum tributum exigunt.*

fine favour and shape;[1] but more than that, he had such a crafty and bewitching fashion[2] both to move pity and to induce belief, as was like a kind of fascination and inchantment to those that saw him or heard him. Thirdly, he had been from his childhood such a wanderer, or (as the King called it) such a landloper, as it was extreme hard to hunt out his nest and parents; neither again could any man, by company or conversing with him, be able to say or detect well what he was; he did so flit from place to place. Lastly, there was a circumstance (which is mentioned by one that writ in the same time) that is very likely to have made somewhat to the matter;[3] which is, that King Edward the Fourth was his godfather.[4] Which, as it is somewhat suspicious for a

[1] *Oris elegantia et corporis lineamentis cum dignitate quadam amabilis.*

[2] *Mores et gestus ejus tam erant vafri et quasi veneficiis quibusdam obliti.*

[3] *Res quædam levis . . . . quam tamen probabile est ad ea quæ postea gesta sunt nonnihil attulisse, eisque tanquam ansam præbuisse.*

[4] This fact is derived from Speed, whose words are "this youth was born (they say) in the city of Torney and called Peter Warbeck; the son of a converted Jew, whose godfather at baptism King Edward himself was." But Speed meant that King Edward was godfather not to Perkin, but to the Jew when he was christened. The fact comes from Bernard André, who mentions it with reference to the Jew's name, which was Edward. He does not say however that Perkin was his *son:* but only that he was brought up (*educatum*) by him. His words are "Petreium quendam Tornacensem, ab Eduardo quodam Judeo, postea a rege Eduardo sacro levato fonte, in hac regione educatum." And in another place he makes Perkin speak of himself as having been in his childhood "Eduardi Judei ac ante memorati regis Eduardi filioli in Anglia *servulus.*" The mistake was pointed out by Sir Frederic Madden in the Archæologia, vol. xxvii. p. 163.

Of course Bacon's speculation upon the circumstance must be set aside; being built entirely upon the supposition that it was Perkin himself to whom King Edward stood godfather. And the true story (if André's authority, uncorroborated by Perkin's confession or by any other contemporary report, be good enough to make it pass for true) is perhaps rather more to the purpose. Whatever we are to understand by the words

wanton prince to become gossip in so mean a house, and might make a man think that he might indeed have in him some base blood of the house of York; so at the least (though that were not) it might give the occasion to the boy, in being called King Edward's godson, or perhaps in sport King Edward's son, to entertain such thoughts into his head. For tutor he had none (for ought that appears[1]), as Lambert Symnell had, until he came unto the Lady Margaret who instructed him.[2]

Thus therefore it came to pass. There was a townsman of Tournay that had borne office in that town, whose name was John Osbeck, (a converted Jew,[3]) married to Katheren de Faro, whose business drew him to live for a time with his wife at London in King Edward the Fourth's days; during which time he had a son by her; and being known in court, the King either out of religious nobleness, because he was a convert, or upon some private acquaintance, did him

educatum and *servulus*, — whether that Perkin was pupil or clerk or apprentice or servant or adopted son to the Jew in question, — we must at least suppose that, in one capacity or another, he was in his family. Now we have it upon the same authority that this Jew was well acquainted with King Edward and his children — "erat enim ille patronus meus" he makes Perkin say, "regi Eduardo ac suis liberis familiarissimus;" Perkin must at least therefore have seen the person of Edward IV., and may very likely have seen something of his court and of his humours: the recollection of which, though not likely to have put it into his head to assume such a part, would be of great use in enabling him to play it. He was about ten years old when Edward died: and a quick-witted boy with a natural gift that way, such as he must have had, might easily at an earlier age than that have observed enough to enable him to fill up the outlines of the story which he had to tell with a great resemblance to the truth.

[1] This is omitted in the translation.

[2] *Quæ eum in omnibus egregie instruxit.*

[3] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "a convert-Jew."

the honour as to be godfather to his child,[1] and named him Peter. But afterwards proving a dainty and effeminate youth, he was commonly called by the diminutive of his name, Peterkin, or Perkin. For as for the name of Warbeck, it was given him when they did but guess at it, before examinations had been taken. But yet he had been so much talked on by that name, as it stuck by him after his true name of Osbeck was known. While he was a young child, his parents returned with him to Tournay. Then was he placed in a house of a kinsman of his, called John Stenbeck, at Antwerp, and so roamed[2] up and down between Antwerp and Tournay and other towns of Flanders for a good time; living much in English company, and having the English tongue perfect. In which time, being grown a comely youth, he was brought by some of the espials of the Lady Margaret into her presence: who viewing him well, and seeing that he had a face and personage that would bear a noble fortune; and finding him otherwise of a fine spirit and winning behaviour; thought she had now found a curious piece of marble to carve out an image of a Duke of York.

[1] See note 4. p. 201. It is to be observed that these particulars are collected by combining Perkin's confession with Bernard André's statement, as Bacon misunderstood it. There is no reason that I know of to suppose that John Osbeck was a Jew, or that he and his wife were ever in London. To correct the story, we must substitute—"There was a townsman, &c., whose name was John Osbeck, married to Catherine de Faro, by whom he had a son that was named Peter. But afterwards, proving a dainty and effeminate youth, &c. &c. While he was a young child he was taken (it seems) to London, and lived there in the house of one Edward, a Jew, that was converted in King Edward IV.'s time; the King himself, either out of religious nobleness (because he was a convert), or upon some private acquaintance, doing him the honour to be his godfather. After he had staid in England some little while, he returned to Tournay. Then was he placed," &c.

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "roved."

She kept him by her a great while, but with extreme secrecy. The while she instructed him by many cabinet conferences; First, in princely behaviour and gesture; teaching him how he should keep state, and yet with a modest sense of his misfortunes: Then she informed him of all the circumstances and particulars that concerned the person of Richard Duke of York, which he was to act; describing unto him the personages, lineaments, and features of the King and Queen his pretended parents, and of his brother and sisters, and divers others that were nearest him in his childhood, together with all passages, some secret, some common, that were fit for a child's memory, until the death of King Edward. Then she added the particulars of the time from the King's death until he and his brother were committed to the Tower, as well during the time he was abroad as while he was in sanctuary. As for the times while he was in the Tower, and the manner of his brother's death, and his own escape; she knew they were things that a very few could controul.[1] And therefore she taught him only to tell a smooth and likely tale of those matters; warning him not to vary from it. It was agreed likewise between them what account he should give of his peregrination abroad; intermixing many things which were true and such as they knew others could testify, for the credit of the rest; but still making them to hang together with the part he was to play. She taught him likewise how to avoid sundry captious and tempting questions, which were like to be asked of

[1] *i. e.* could correct him in. *Tam clandestina fuisse, ut pauci admodum, quæcunque ei confingere liberet, arguere possent; itaque libero prorsus mendacio se uti posse.*

him. But in this she found him of himself so nimble and shifting,[1] as she trusted much to his own wit and readiness; and therefore laboured the less in it. Lastly, she raised his thoughts with some present rewards and further promises; setting before him chiefly the glory and fortune of a crown, if things went well; and a sure refuge to her court if the worst should fall. After such time as she thought he was perfect in his lesson, she began to cast with herself from what coast this blazing star should first appear, and at what time.[2] It must be upon the horizon of Ireland; for there had the like meteor strong influence before. The time of the apparition to be, when the King should be engaged into a war with France. But well she knew that whatsoever should come from her would be held suspected. And therefore if he should go out of Flanders immediately into Ireland she might be thought to have some hand in it. And besides, the time was not yet ripe; for that the two Kings were then upon terms of peace.[3] Therefore she wheeled about; and to put all suspicion afar off, and loth to keep him any longer by her (for that she knew secrets are not long-lived), she sent him unknown into Portugal, with the Lady Brampton, an English lady (that embarked for Portugal at that time), with some *privado* of her own to have an eye upon him; and there he was to remain

[1] *Ita instar anguillæ lubricum et ad elabendum promptum reperit.*

[2] Ed. 1622 has no stop after "time:" which is evidently a mistake. The Latin translation explains the intended construction of the sentence, so that there can be no room for doubt. *A quâ cœli plagâ cometa iste se primo ostendere deberet, et quo tempore. Constituit autem hoc fieri oportere ab horizonte Hiberniæ . . . tempus autem apparitionis maxime opportunum fore cum rex*, &c.

[3] The translation has *de pace tractarent.* The time spoken of seems to have been some time in 1490.

and to expect her further directions. In the mean time she omitted not to prepare things for his better welcome and accepting, not only in the kingdom of Ireland, but in the court of France. He continued in Portugal about a year; and by that time the King of England called his Parliament[1] (as hath been said), and had declared[2] open war against France. Now did the sign reign, and the constellation was comen, under which Perkin should appear. And therefore he was straight sent unto by the Duchess to go for Ireland, according to the first designment. In Ireland he did arrive[3] at the town of Cork. When he was thither comen, his own tale was (when he made his confession afterwards) that the Irishmen finding him in some good clothes, came flocking about him, and bore him down

[1] The Parliament, as I have said, was not called till October, 1491. But open war was declared against France at least as early as the 7th of July preceding (see the preamble of the Commission for the Benevolence; Rymer, xii. p. 446.); probably earlier; see the Commission for Array and Musters, May 5, 1491, in which it is said that "Charles, calling himself King of France, *intends to invade the realm.*" Cal. Pat. Rolls, 6 Hen. VII. p. 71.

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 omits "had."

[3] I have not been able to ascertain the exact date of his arrival in Ireland. But on the 6th of December, 1491, a Commission was issued, reciting that the King had determined to send an army to parts of the counties of Kilkenne and Typparary in the land of Ireland, to suppress his rebels and enemies there; and appointing James Ormond, and Thomas Garth, Esqs., captains and governors of the forces, with power to pass over the sea and invade the land; also to take the musters of the said army and of the king's lieges, and to make statutes and issue proclamations for the government of the same, &c. &c.; and declaring the power of the lieutenant of Ireland suspended with respect to the said army. See Cal. Pat. Rolls, 6 Dec. 7 Hen. VII.

As Perkin was certainly in Ireland, and in communication with the Earl of Desmond, in the February following (see note 2. p. 207.), it is probable that this rebellion had something to do with him. It also helps to explain the conduct of the Scotch King with regard to the truce. See note 2. p. 184.

that he was the Duke of Clarence that had been there before: and after, that he was Richard the Third's base son: and lastly, that he was Richard Duke of York, second son to Edward the Fourth: but that he for his part renounced all these things, and offered to swear upon the holy Evangelists that he was no such man, till at last they forced it upon him,[1] and bad him fear nothing; and so forth. But the truth is, that immediately upon his coming into Ireland, he took upon him the said person of the Duke of York, and drew unto him complices and partakers by all the means he could devise. Insomuch as he writ his letters unto the Earls of Desmond and Kildare,[2] to come in to his aid and be of his party; the originals of which letters are yet extant.

Somewhat before this time,[3] the Duchess had also gained unto her a near servant of King Henry's own,

[1] *Vi quâdam ad quicquid illi vellent agnoscendum eum adegissent.*

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "wrote." This statement is accidentally confirmed by an entry in the Treasurer's Books of Scotland, quoted by Tytler, vol. iv. p. 373.: — "Given at the King's command to an Englishman, called Edward Ormond, that brought letters forth of Ireland *fra King Edward's son* and the Earl of Desmond, ix lb." The entry is dated March 2, 1491; that is, of course, 1491–2: a date worth remarking in connexion with the refusal of the Scotch King to ratify the five-years' truce with England which was concluded by the Commissioners in the preceding December and signed by Henry on the 12th of January. The arrival and reception of Perkin in Ireland would be a sufficient motive to make James unwilling to bind himself to peace with Henry for so long a period. See note 2. p. 184. By the time the nine-months' truce that was substituted was about to expire, Henry had made his peace with France, and Perkin had been sent away from the French court. And then it was that James agreed to prolong the truce for a year and a half. See note 2. p. 198.

[3] The Latin translation has *circa idem tempus.* Perkin in his confession mentions *Maister Stephen Fryam* as one of the persons sent from France to invite him to the French court. Another French secretary was appointed by the King on the 16th of June, 1490. See Cal. Pat. Rolls, p. 53.

one Stephen Frion, his secretary for the French tongue; an active man, but turbulent and discontented. This Frion had fled over to Charles the French King, and put himself into his service, at such time as he began to be in open enmity with the King.[1] Now King Charles, when he understood of the person and attempts of Perkin, ready of himself to embrace all advantages against the King of England, instigated by Frion, and formerly prepared by the Lady Margaret, forthwith despatched one Lucas and this Frion in nature[2] of ambassadors to Perkin, to advertise him of the King's good inclination to him, and that he was resolved to aid him to recover his right against King Henry, an usurper of England and an enemy of France; and wished him to come over unto him at Paris. Perkin thought himself in heaven now that he was invited by so great a King in so honourable a manner. And imparting unto his friends in Ireland for their encouragement how fortune called him, and what great hopes he had, sailed presently into France. When he was comen to the court of France, the King received him with great honour, saluted, and stiled him by the name of the Duke of York, lodged him and accommodated him in great state; and the better to give him the representation and the countenance of a Prince, assigned him a guard for his person, whereof the Lord Congresall was captain. And the courtiers likewise (though it be ill mocking with the French[3]) applied

[1] *i. e.* as King Charles began to be in open enmity with King Henry. The Latin translation expresses it more correctly: *quo tempore bellum inter reges pullulare cœpisset.*

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "in the nature."

[3] *i. e.* though they are not good at playing a part. *Licet apud Gallos ludos facere in proclivi non sit.*

themselves to their King's bent, seeing there was reason of state for it. At the same time there repaired unto Perkin divers Englishmen of quality; Sir George Neville, Sir John Taylor, and about one hundred more; and amongst the rest, this Stephen Frion of whom we spake, who followed his fortune both then and for a long time after, and was indeed his principal counsellor and instrument in all his proceedings. But all this on the French King's part was but a trick, the better to bow King Henry to peace. And therefore upon the first grain of incense that was sacrificed upon the altar of peace at Bulloigne, Perkin was smoked away. Yet would not the French King deliver him up to King Henry (as he was laboured to do[1]), for his honour's sake; but warned him away and dismissed him. And Perkin on his part was as ready to be gone, doubting he might be caught up underhand. He therefore took his way into Flanders unto the Duchess of Burgundy; pretending that having been variously tossed by fortune he directed his course thither as to a safe harbour; no ways taking knowledge that he had ever been there before, but as if that had been his first address. The Duchess on the other part made it as new and strange to see him; and pretending at the first she[2] was taught and made wise by the example of Lambert Symnell, how she did admit

[1] *Licet ab eo de hoc interpellatus.*

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 omits "and" before "pretending," inserts "that" before "she," and has a full stop after "satisfied;"—a correction possibly,—to avoid the awkwardness of the repetition; which however it hardly removes. The construction as it stands is more natural, and the only change wanted is the substitution of some equivalent phrase for "pretending at the first."

of any counterfeit stuff (though even in that she said she was not fully satisfied), she pretended at the first (and that was ever in the presence of others) to pose him and sift him, thereby to try whether he were indeed the very Duke of York or no. But seeming to receive full satisfaction by his answers, then she feigned herself to be transported with a kind of astonishment, mixt of joy and wonder, of[1] his miraculous deliverance; receiving him as if he were risen from death to life; and inferring that God, who had in such wonderful manner preserved him from death, did likewise reserve him for some great and prosperous fortune. As for his dismission out of France, they interpreted it, not as if he were detected or neglected for a counterfeit deceiver; but contrariwise that it did shew manifestly unto the world that he was some great matter; for that it was his abandoning that (in effect) made the peace;[2] being no more but the sacrificing of a poor distressed Prince unto the utility and ambition of two mighty monarchs. Neither was Perkin for his part wanting to himself either in gracious and princely behaviour, or in ready and apposite answers, or in contenting and caressing those that did apply themselves unto him, or in pretty scorns or disdains[3] to those that seemed to doubt of him; but in all things did notably acquit himself: insomuch as it was generally believed (as well amongst great persons as amongst the vulgar) that he was indeed Duke Richard. Nay himself with long and continual counterfeiting

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "at."

[2] *Quamvis causa ejus destitutio et desertio revera tanti erat, ut, si quis recte omnia inveniret, pacem confecisset.*

[3] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "scorn or disdain."

and with often telling a lie, was turned (by habit) almost into the thing he seemed to be, and from a liar to a believer.[1] The Duchess therefore, as in a case out of doubt, did him all princely honour, calling him always by the name of her nephew, and giving him the delicate title of the White Rose of England; and appointed him a guard of thirty persons, halberdiers, clad in a party-coloured livery of murrey and blue, to attend his person. Her court likewise, and generally the Dutch and strangers,[2] in their usage towards him expressed no less respect.

The news hereof came blazing and thundering over into England, that the Duke of York was sure alive. As for the name of Perkin Warbeck, it was not at that time comen to light, but all the news ran[3] upon the Duke of York; that he had been entertained in Ireland, bought and sold in France, and was now plainly avowed and in great honour in Flanders. These fames took hold of divers; in some upon discontent, in some upon ambition, in some upon levity and desire of change, in some few upon conscience and belief, but in most upon simplicity,[4] and in divers out of dependence upon some of the better sort who did in secret favour and nourish these bruits. And it was

[1] *Quasi quæ fingeret simul et crederet.* This suggestion comes from Speed. Shakespeare, in the Tempest, has the same thought —

> "Like one
> Who having unto Truth, by telling oft,
> Made such a sinner of his memory
> To credit his own lie, he did believe
> He was indeed the Duke."

[2] The translation has *tam Flandri quam peregrini:* the *Flemings* and strangers both.

[3] So Ed. 1622. The MS. has "came."

[4] *Imbecillitatem judicii.*

not long ere these rumours of novelty had begotten others of scandal and murmur against the King and his government, taxing him for a great taxer of his people and discountenancer of his nobility. The loss of Brittaine and the peace with France were not forgotten; but chiefly they fell upon the wrong that he did his Queen, and that he did not reign in her right; wherefore they said that God had now brought to light a masculine branch of the House of York that would not be at his courtesy, howsoever he did depress his poor lady. And yet (as it fareth in things which are current with the multitude and which they affect) these fames grew so general, as the authors were lost in the generality of speakers; they being like running weeds that have no certain root, or like footings up and down impossible to be traced. But after a while these ill humours drew to an head, and settled secretly in some eminent persons;[1] which were Sir William Stanley Lord Chamberlain of the King's household, the Lord Fitzwater, Sir Symond Mountford, Sir Thomas Thwaits. These entered into a secret conspiracy to favour Duke Richard's title; nevertheless none engaged their fortunes in this business openly but two, Sir Robert Clifford and master William Barley, who sailed over into Flanders, sent indeed from the party of the conspirators here to understand the truth of those things that passed there, and not without some help of moneys from hence, provisionally to be delivered — if they found and were satisfied that there was truth in these pretences. The person of Sir Robert Clifford (being a gentleman of fame and fam-

[1] *Atque occulto in viris aliquibus magnæ dignitatis, veluti in partibus nobilibus, sedes repererunt: quorum præcipui erant*, &c.

ily) was extremely welcome to the Lady Margaret, who after she had conference with him brought him to the sight of Perkin, with whom he had often speech and discourse. So that in the end, won either by the Duchess to affect[1] or by Perkin to believe, he wrote back into England, that he knew the person of Richard Duke of York as well as he knew his own, and that this young man was undoubtedly he. By this means all things grew prepared to revolt and sedition here, and the conspiracy came to have a correspondence between Flanders and England.[2]

The King on his part was not asleep. But to arm or levy forces yet, he thought he would but show fear, and do this idol too much worship. Nevertheless the ports he did shut up, or at least kept a watch on them, that none should pass to or fro that was suspected. But for the rest he chose to work by countermine. His purposes were two; the one to lay open the abuse; the other to break the knot of the conspirators.[3] To detect the abuse, there were but two ways; the first to make it manifest to the world that the Duke of York was indeed murdered; the other to prove that (were he dead or alive) yet Perkin was a counterfeit. For the first, thus it stood. There were but four persons that could speak upon knowledge to the murder of the

[1] The translation has *ut conatibus suis faveret.* From which it would appear that the word "affect" is used here in its old sense of "to regard with affection;" however its modern sense of "to pretend" may seem to suit the context.

[2] *i. e.* the conspiracy in Flanders and the conspiracy in England came into correspondence. The expression in the Latin is more exact and clear — *Hoc modo factum est ut omnia hic in Angliâ ad defectionem et seditionem spectarent; et conjuratio foveri cœpit mutuo tractatu inter Flandriam et Angliam.*

[3] *Ut conjuratos inter se committeret.*

Duke of York; Sir James Tirrell (the employed-man from King Richard), John Dighton and Myles Forrest his servants (the two butchers or tormentors), and the priest of the Tower that buried them; of which four, Myles Forrest and the priest were dead, and there remained alive only Sir James Tirrell and John Dighton. These two the King caused to be committed to the Tower[1] and examined touching the manner of the

[1] This is not mentioned by any historian who preceded Bacon; and I have not been able to discover his authority for stating that Tirrell and Dighton were examined on the subject *at this time*. The account of their confession which follows comes no doubt from the history ascribed to Sir Thomas More; who adds, "Very troth is it and well known that at such time as Sir James Tirrell was in the Tower for treason committed against the most famous prince King Henry VII., both Dighton and he were examined and confessed the murder in manner above written." But the time when Tirrell was in the Tower for treason against Henry was many years after, in 1502. And there is nothing in More's narrative to make one think that he supposed the confession to have been made at an earlier period. It was a point however in which he might easily be mistaken, (especially if Tirrell *repeated* at his death the same story which he had told before, as he very likely might), and Bacon may have had sufficient evidence for correcting him. Certainly among the persons arrested at the same time with Tirrell in 1502 there is no mention of *Dighton*.

But there is a circumstance which makes me suspect that Henry had in fact obtained a confession from Tirrell some time before.

On the 9th of August, 1484, Sir James Tyrrell had received a grant from Richard III. of the stewardship of the Duchy of Cornwall, and on the 13th of September following "a grant of the offices of Sheriff of the Lordship of Wenllouk, and steward of the Lordships of Newport, Wenllouk, Kovoeth-Meredith, Lavenithevery, and Lanthoesant, in Wales and the marches thereof" (see Ninth Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Records, App. 94.); and on the 19th of February, 1485-6, he had received from Henry himself a grant for life of the offices of Sheriff of the County of Glamorgan and Margannot," &c. (Cal. Pat. Rolls, i. p. 236.) Two years after however, viz. on the 26th of February, 3 Hen. VII. (*i. e.* 1487-8), — I find that a commission was granted to certain persons there named, reciting that "in consideration of the services of Sir James Tyrrell, a knight of the King's body, it had been granted to him to be recompensed of the issues of the County of Guysnes in the marches of Calais, in such wise as he holdeth him content; amounting to the value of all the profits of his *lands*, rents, &c. in Wales, at the beginning of this reign:" which lands

death of the two innocent princes. They agreed both in a tale (as the King gave out) to this effect: That King Richard having directed his warrant for the putting of them to death to Brackenbury, the Lieutenant of the Tower, was by him refused; whereupon the King directed his warrant to Sir James Tirrell to receive the keys of the Tower from the lieutenant (for the space of a night) for the King's especial service. That Sir James Tirrell accordingly repaired to the Tower by night, attended by his two servants aforenamed, whom he had chosen for the[1] purpose. That himself stood at the stair-foot, and sent these two villains to execute the murder. That they smothered them in their bed; and, that done, called up their master to see their naked bodies dead,[2] which they had laid forth. That they were buried under the stairs, and some stones cast upon them. That when the re-

were now transferred to the charge of the Commissioners. (Cal. Pat. Rolls, ii. p. 89.) Now it will be remembered that in the interval between Feb. 19, 1485–6 and Feb. 26, 1487–8 had occurred the rebellion of Lambert Symnell, which was suppressed in the summer of 1487; and that Symnell had been originally intended to play the part of Edward Duke of York, one of the murdered princes. This would naturally stir Henry to search out the history of the murder. And if in the course of his inquiries he became acquainted with the part which Tirrell had played in it, he would naturally wish to get him out of England as soon as he could. To punish him for the murder, for which we must suppose that he had obtained from Richard a full pardon, was probably not in Henry's power; and he may very likely have elicited the confession upon a promise of not harming him; but he would wish to get him out of the way; and for that purpose might offer him an equivalent abroad for what he possessed at home. The story which he told, Henry may with characteristic closeness have kept to himself; till the appearance of Perkin Warbeck in the same character made it expedient to divulge it. And the time when the story was "given out" may have led to an error as to the time when the confession was made.

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "that."

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "naked dead bodies."

port was made to King Richard that his will was done, he gave Sir James Tirrell great thanks; but took exception to the place of their burial, being too[1] base for them that were King's children; whereupon another night by the King's warrant renewed, their bodies were removed by the priest of the Tower, and buried by him in some place which (by means of the priest's death soon after) could not be known. Thus much was then delivered abroad, to be the effect of those examinations; but the King nevertheless made no use of them in any of his declarations. Whereby, as it seems, those examinations left the business somewhat perplexed. And as for Sir James Tirrell, he was long[2] after beheaded in the Tower-yard for other matters of treason. But John Dighton, who it seemeth spake best for the King, was forthwith set at liberty, and was the principal means of divulging this tradition. Therefore this kind of proof being left so naked,[3] the King used the more diligence in the latter, for the tracing of Perkin. To this purpose he sent abroad into several parts, and especially into Flanders, divers secret and nimble scouts and spies; some feigning themselves to fly over unto Perkin, and to adhere unto him; and

[1] So Ed. 1622. The MS. has "so base."

[2] So the MS. The edition of 1622 has "*soon* after:" an alteration which can hardly have been made by Bacon, because it is inconsistent with his own narrative. But it may very well have been hazarded by a corrector of the press, who thought the context required it.

It must be confessed however that, if "long" be the right reading, the sentence is oddly introduced and hardly to the purpose. And it would rather seem as if Bacon when writing this part of his narrative had been under a wrong impression as to the date of Tirrell's execution, and had made the correction afterwards. This MS. is of earlier date, it is true, than the printed book; but the book may have been printed from another copy in which the correction had not been made.

[3] *i. e.* ill-furnished. The translation has *nudum et jejunam.*

some under other pretences to learn, search, and discover all the circumstances and particulars of Perkin's parents, birth, person, travels up and down, and in brief, to have a journal (as it were) of his life and doings; and[1] furnished these his employed-men liberally with money, to draw on and reward intelligences; giving them also in charge, to advertise continually what they found, and nevertheless still to go on. And ever as one advertisement and discovery called up another, he employed other new men, where the business did require it. Others he employed in a more special nature and trust, to be his pioners in the main countermine. These were directed to insinuate themselves into the familiarity and confidence of the principal persons of the party in Flanders, and so to learn what associates they had and correspondents either here in England or abroad; and how far every one was[2] engaged; and what new ones they meant afterwards to try or board:[3] and as this for the persons, so for the actions themselves, to discover to the bottom (as they could) the utmost of Perkin and the conspirators their intentions, hopes, and practices. These latter best betrust[4] spies had some of them further instructions, to practice and draw off the best friends and servants of Perkin, by making remonstrance to them how weakly his enterprise and hopes were built, and with how prudent and potent a King they had to deal; and to reconcile them to the King with promise of pardon and good conditions of reward. And above the rest to assail, sap, and work into the constancy of Sir Robert

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "he furnished."
[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 omits "was."
[3] *Tentare et allicere.*
[4] *Exploratores pro fidelioribus habiti.*

Clifford, and to win him (if they could), being the man that knew most of their secrets, and who being won away would most appall and discourage the rest, and in a manner break the knot. There is a strange tradition, that the King lost[1] in a wood of suspicions, and not knowing whom to trust, had both intelligence[2] with the confessors and chaplains of divers great men; and for the better credit of his espials abroad with the contrary side, did use to have them cursed at Paul's (by name) amongst the bead-roll of the King's enemies, according to the custom of those times. These spials plied their charge so roundly, as the King had an anatomy of Perkin alive; and was likewise well informed of the particular correspondent conspirators in England, and many other mysteries were revealed; and Sir Robert Clifford in especial won to be assured to the King, and industrious and officious for his service. The King therefore (receiving a rich return of his diligence, and great satisfaction touching a number of particulars,) first divulged and spread abroad the imposture and juggling of Perkin's person and travels, with the circumstances thereof, throughout the realm; not by proclamation (because things were yet in examination, and so might receive the more or the less,) but by court-fames, which commonly print better than printed proclamations. Then thought he it also time to send an ambassage unto Archduke Philip into Flanders, for the abandoning and dismissing of Perkin. Herein he employed Sir Edward Poynings, and Sir William Warham[3] doctor of the canon law. The

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "being lost."

[2] *Secreto egisse ut ex iis de consiliis adversariorum suorum edoceretur.*

[3] In Ellis's Letters, 2nd series, vol. i. p. 167., there is a privy seal for

Archduke was then young and governed by his counsel. Before whom the ambassadors had audience. And Dr. Warham spake in this manner:

"My lords, the King our master is very sorry, that England and your country here of Flanders having been counted as man and wife for so long time, now this country of all others should be the stage where a base counterfeit should play the part of a King of England, not only to his Grace's disquiet and dishonour, but to the scorn and reproach of all sovereign Princes. To counterfeit the dead image of a King in his coin is an high offence by all laws. But to counterfeit the living image of a King in his person exceedeth all falsifications, except it should be that of a Mahomet or an Antichrist, that counterfeit divine honour. The King hath too great an opinion of this sage counsel, to think that any of you is caught with this fable (though way may be given by you to the passion of some), the thing in itself is so improbable. To set testimonies aside of the death of Duke Richard, which the King hath upon record plain and infallible, (because they may be thought to be in the King's own power,) let the thing testify for itself. Sense and reason no power can command. Is it possible (trow you) that King Richard should damn his soul and foul his name with so abominable a murder, and yet not mend his case? Or do you think that men of blood (that were his instruments) did turn to pity in the midst of their execution? whereas in cruel and savage beasts, and men also,[1]

payment of money to Sir E. Poynings and Sir W. Warham, for their embassy. It is dated the 5th of July (1493); and it appears that they had not then set out.

[1] *In feris ipsis, nec minus in hominibus ferinæ natura.*

the first draught of blood doth yet make them more fierce and enraged. Do you not know that the bloody executioners of tyrants do go to such errands with an halter about their neck, so that if they perform not they are sure to die for it? And do you think that these men would hazard their own lives for sparing another's? Admit they should have saved him; what should they have done with him? Turn him into London streets? that the watchmen, or any passenger that should light upon him, might carry him before a justice, and so all come to light? Or should they have kept him by them secretly? That surely would have required a great deal of care, charge, and continual fears. But, my lords, I labour too much in a clear business. The King is so wise, and hath so good friends abroad, as now he knoweth Duke Perkin from his cradle. And because he is a great Prince, if you have any good poet here, he can help him with notes to write his life, and to parallel him with Lambert Symnell, now the King's falconer. And therefore, to speak plainly to your lordships, it is the strangest thing in the world, that the Lady Margaret (excuse us if we name her, whose malice to the King is both causeless and endless,) should now when she is old, at the time when other women give over child-bearing, bring forth two such monsters, being not the births of nine or ten months, but of many years. And whereas other natural mothers bring forth children weak, and not able to help themselves; she bringeth forth tall stripplings, able soon after their coming into the world to bid battle to mighty Kings. My lords, we stay unwillingly upon this part: we would to God that lady would once

taste the joys which God Almighty doth serve up unto her, in beholding her niece to reign in such honour, and with so much royal issue, which she might be pleased to account as her own. The King's request unto the Archduke and your lordships might be, that according to the example of King Charles, who hath already discarded him, you would banish this unworthy fellow out of your dominions. But because the King may justly expect more from an ancient confederate than from a new reconciled enemy, he maketh it[1] his request unto you to deliver him up into his hands: pirates and impostors of this sort being fit to be accounted the common enemies of mankind, and no ways to be protected by the law of nations."

After some time of deliberation, the ambassadors received this short answer: That the Archduke, for the love of King Henry, would in no sort aid or assist the pretended Duke, but in all things conserve the amity he had with the King. But for the Duchess Dowager, she was absolute in the lands of her dowry, and that he could not let her to dispose of her own.

The King, upon the return of the ambassadors, was nothing satisfied with this answer: for well he knew that a patrimonial dowry carried no part of sovereignty or command of forces.[2] Besides, the ambassadors told him plainly, that they saw the Duchess had a great party in the Archduke's counsel; and that

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 omits "it."

[2] *i. e.* none of the prerogatives of sovereignty, such as the command of forces: as it is more clearly expressed in the translation—*nihil quod absoluti imperii esset* (*quale est copiarum administratio*) *secum transferre.*

howsoever it was carried in a course of connivance,[1] yet the Archduke underhand gave aid and furtherance to Perkin. Wherefore (partly out of courage[2] and partly out of policy) the King forthwith banished all Flemings (as well their persons as their wares) out of his kingdom; commanding his subjects likewise (and by name his Merchants Adventurers) which had a resiance in Antwerp, to return; translating the mart (which commonly followed the English cloth) unto Calais, and embarred also all further trade for the future.[3] This the King did, being sensible in point of honour[4] not to suffer a pretender to the crown of England to affront him so near at hand, and he to keep terms of friendship with the country where he did set up. But he had also a further reach; for that he knew well that the subjects of Flanders drew so great commodity from the trade of England, as by this embargo they would soon wax weary of Perkin; and that the tumults of Flanders had been so late and fresh, as it was no time for the Prince to displease the people. Nevertheless for form's sake, by way of requital, the Archduke did

[1] *i. e.* howsoever the Archduke pretended only to connive at the entertainment of Perkin. *Utcunque Archidux ad res Perkini connivere tantum simularet.*

[2] *Animum explere cupiens.*

[3] *i. e.* all trade between the English and the Flemings. The translation has *cum Burgundis;* by which word *Flemings* a few lines above is rendered. It was on the 18th of September, 1493, that the sheriffs were directed to publish the proclamation forbidding mercantile intercourse (by importation or exportation without license under the great seal) with the subjects of the Archduke of Austriche and the Duke of Burgoyne. See Cal. Pat. Rolls, 9 Hen. VII. p. 80.

[4] *i. e.* feeling himself interested in point of honour. The Latin is a little fuller: *partim ut nihil honori suo indignum fieri permitteret, qui haud parum perstringi posset si quis ad coronam Angliæ prætensor*, &c.

likewise banish the English out of Flanders; which in effect was done to his hand.

The King being well advertised that Perkin did more trust upon friends and partakers within the realm than upon foreign arms, thought it behoved him to apply the remedy where the disease[1] lay, and to proceed with severity against some of the principal conspirators here within the realm; thereby to purge the ill humours in England, and to cool the hopes in Flanders. Wherefore he caused to be apprehended, almost at an instant, John Ratcliffe Lord Fitzwater, Sir Symon Mountford, Sir Thomas Thwaites, William Dawbeny, Robert Ratcliffe, Thomas Chressenor, and Thomas Astwood. All these were arraigned, convicted, and condemned for high treason, in adhering and promising aid to Perkin. Of these the Lord Fitzwater was conveyed to Calais, and there kept in hold and in hope of life, until soon after (either impatient or betrayed) he dealt with his keeper to have escaped, and thereupon was beheaded. But Sir Symon Mountford, Robert Ratcliffe, and William Dawbeny, were beheaded immediately after their condemnation. The rest were pardoned, together with many others,[2] clerks and laics, amongst which were two Dominican friars, and William Worseley[3] Dean of Paul's; which latter sort[4] passed examination, but came not to public trial.[5]

[1] *Fomes morbi.*

[2] This is omitted in the translation.

[3] William Worsely, Clk., Dean of St. Paul's, London, received his pardon on the 6th of June, 1495. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 10 Hen. VII. p. 57.

[4] *Clerici autem.*

[5] Tytler in his History of Scotland (vol. iv. p. 374–5.) supplies a fact, not mentioned in any previous history, which is of considerable importance to the understanding of Henry's position at this juncture, and par-

The Lord Chamberlain at that time was not touched; whether it were that the King would not stir too many humours at once, but, after the manner of good physicians, purge the head last; or that Clifford (from whom most of these discoveries came) reserved that piece for his own coming over;[1] signifying only to the King in the mean time that he doubted there were some greater ones in the business, whereof he would give the King farther account when he came to his presence.

ticularly of his relations with Scotland. "This discovery," he says, speaking of the information given by Sir R. Clifford, "was a fatal blow to the Yorkists. Their project was probably to have proclaimed Perkin in England, whilst his numerous adherents prepared to rise in Ireland; *and the Scottish monarch was to break at the head of his army across the Borders, and compel Henry to divide his force.* But the Border chiefs, impatient for war, invaded England too soon; and it happened, unfortunately for Warbeck, that *whilst a tumultuous force, including the Armstrongs, Elwalds, Crossars, Wighams, Nyksons, and Henrisons, penetrated into Northumberland, with the hope of promoting a rising in favour of the counterfeit Duke of York,* the treachery of Clifford had revealed the whole particulars of the conspiracy; and the apprehension and execution of the ringleaders struck such terror into the nation, that the cause of Perkin in that country was for the present considered hopeless." "This raid or invasion," adds Mr. Tytler in a note, "which is unknown to our historians, is mentioned nowhere but in the record of justiciary, Nov. 1493. Mr. Stirling's MS. Chron. Notes, p. 55." The total omission from our histories of so considerable a fact as an incursion of this kind at such a conjuncture and during a truce (especially if Mr. Tytler be right in supposing that it was intended to be part of a combined movement in concert with Flanders, Ireland, and the Yorkists in England) shows how ill we can judge of the questions of state with which Henry had to deal.

It appears from an entry in the Calendar of Patent Rolls, dated 8 March, 8 Hen. VII. [1492-3], that an armed force was then about to be sent into Ireland under Sir Roger Cotton, "to war with the rebels" (p. 71.); who seem to have been speedily suppressed, for we find general pardons granted to several principal persons in Ireland on the 22nd and 30th of March, the 10th of April, and the 29th of May following. See Cal. Pat. Rolls, pp. 85. 81, 82. A fact which agrees very well with Tytler's statement.

[1] The translation adds *ut rem maximi momenti.*

Upon Allhallows-day-even, being now the tenth year of the King's reign, the King's second son Henry was created Duke of York; and as well the Duke, as divers others, noblemen, knights-bachelors, and gentlemen of quality, were made Knights of the Bath according to the ceremony. Upon the morrow after Twelfth-day, the King removed from Westminster[1] (where he had kept his Christmas) to the Tower of London. This he did as soon as he had advertisement that Sir Robert Clifford (in whose bosom or budget most of Perkin's secrets were laid up) was comen into England. And the place of the Tower was chosen to that end, that if Clifford should accuse any of the great ones, they might without suspicion or noise or sending abroad of warrants be presently attached; the court and prison being within the cincture of one wall. After a day or two the King drew unto him a selected counsel, and admitted Clifford to his presence; who first fell down at his feet, and in all humble manner craved the King's pardon; which the King then granted,[2] though he were indeed secretly assured of his life before. Then, commanded to tell his knowledge, he did amongst many others (of himself not interrogated) impeach Sir William Stanley, the Lord Chamberlain of the King's household.

The King seemed to be much amazed at the naming of this lord; as if he had heard the news of some strange and fearful prodigy. To hear a man that had done him service of so high a nature as to save his life

[1] So Stowe. According to the old Chronicle (Cott. Vitel. A. xvi.) he kept his Christmas at Greenwich.

[2] Sir Robert Clifford received his pardon on the 22nd of December, 1494. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 10 Hen. VII. p. 33.

and set the crown upon his head; a man that enjoyed by his favour and advancement so great a fortune both in honour and riches; a man that was tied unto him in so near a band of alliance, his brother having married the King's mother; and lastly a man to whom he had committed the trust of his person, in making him his chamberlain: that this man, no ways disgraced, no ways discontent, no ways put in fear, should be false unto him. Clifford was required to say over again and again the particulars of his accusation; being warned, that in a matter so unlikely, and that concerned so great a servant of the King's, he should not in any wise go too far. But the King finding that he did sadly and constantly (without hesitation or varying, and with those civil protestations that were fit,) stand to that that he had said, offering to justify it upon his soul and life; he caused him to be removed. And after he had not a little bemoaned himself unto his counsel there present, gave order that Sir William Stanley should be restrained in his own chamber, where he lay before, in the square tower. And the next day he was examined by the lords. Upon his examination he denied little of that wherewith he was charged, nor endeavoured much to excuse or extenuate his fault. So that (not very wisely), thinking to make his offence less by confession, he made it enough for condemnation. It was conceived that he trusted much to his former merits and the interest that his brother had in the King. But those helps were over-weighed by divers things that made against him, and were predominant in the King's nature and mind. First, an over-merit; for convenient merit, unto which reward may easily reach, doth best with Kings: Next, the

sense of his power; for the King thought that he that could set him up was the more dangerous to pull him down: Thirdly, the glimmering of a confiscation; for he was the richest subject for value in the kingdom; there being found in his castle of Holte forty thousand marks in ready money and plate, besides jewels, household-stuff, stocks upon his grounds, and other personal estate exceeding great; and for his revenue in land and fee, it was three thousand pounds a year of old rent,[1] a great matter in those times:[2] Lastly, the nature of the time; for if the King had been out of fear of his own estate, it was not unlike he would have spared his life; but the cloud of so great a rebellion hanging over his head made him work sure. Wherefore after some six weeks' distance of time, which the King did honourably interpose, both to give space to his brother's intercession, and to shew to the world that he had a conflict with himself what he should do, he was arraigned of high-treason, and condemned, and presently after beheaded.[3]

It is yet[4] to this day left but in dark memory, both what the case of this noble person was, for which he suffered; and what likewise was the ground and cause of his defection and alienation[5] of his heart from the King. His case was said to be this; that in discourse between Sir Robert Clifford and him he had said, That if he were sure that that young man were King Ed-

[1] *Antiqui censûs.*

[2] *Res mira et fere inaudita.* The inventory of the money found at Holt is preserved in the Rolls-house. Chapter-House Records, A. 3. 10. fo. 29.

[3] He was arraigned on the 31st of January, and executed on the 16th of February, 1494–5. (Old Chron.)

[4] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "Yet is it."

[5] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "the alienation."

ward's son, he would never bear arms against him. This case seems somewhat a hard case, both in respect of the conditional, and in[1] respect of the other words. But for the conditional, it seemeth the judges of that time (who were learned men, and the three chief of them of the privy counsel,) thought it was a dangerous thing to admit Ifs and Ands to qualify words of treason; whereby every man might express his malice, and blanch his danger. And it was like to the case (in the following times) of Elizabeth Barton, the holy maid of Kent, who had said, That if King Henry the Eighth did not take Catherine his wife again, he should be deprived of his crown, and die the death of a dog. And infinite cases may be put of like nature; which it seemeth the grave judges taking into consideration, would not admit of treasons upon condition.[2] And as for the positive words, That he would not bear arms against King Edward's son; though the words seem calm, yet it was a plain and direct over-ruling of the King's title, either by the line of Lancaster or by act of Parliament; which no doubt pierced the King more than if Stanley had charged his lance upon him in the field. For if Stanley would hold that opinion, That a son of King Edward had still the better right, he being so principal a person of authority and favour about the King, it was to teach all England to say as much. And therefore, as those times were,[3] that speech touched the quick. But some writers do put this out of doubt; for they say that Stanley did expressly promise to aid Perkin, and sent him some help of treasure.[4]

[1] MS. omits "in."

[2] *Noluerunt prorsus proditionibus cum clausulâ conditionali patrocinari.*

[3] *Si quis temporum illorum conditionem rite introspiciat.*

[4] This is the statement of Bernard André, as quoted by Speed.

Now for the motive of his falling off from the King. It is true that at Bosworth-field the King was beset, and in a manner inclosed round about by the troops of King Richard, and in manifest danger of his life; when this Stanley was sent by his brother with three thousand men to his rescue, which he performed so, that King Richard was slain upon the place. So as the condition of mortal men is not capable of a greater benefit than the King received by the hands of Stanley; being like the benefit of Christ, at once to save and crown. For which service the King gave him great gifts,[1] made him his counsellor and chamberlain; and (somewhat contrary to his nature) had winked at the great spoils of Bosworth-field, which came almost wholly to this man's hands, to his infinite enriching. Yet nevertheless, blown up with the conceit of his merit, he did not think he had received good measure from the King, at least not pressing-down and running over, as he expected. And his ambition was so exorbitant and unbounded, as he became suitor to the King for the Earldom of Chester: which ever being a kind of appanage to the principality of Wales, and using to go to the King's son, his suit did not only end in a denial but in a distaste: the King perceiving thereby that his desires were intemperate, and his cogitations vast and irregular, and that his former benefits were but cheap and lightly regarded by him. Wherefore the King began not to brook him well;[2] and as a little leaven of new distaste doth commonly sour the whole lump of former merits, the king's wit began now to

[1] So Polydore Vergil says. In the Latin translation, Bacon substitutes *maximam gratiam habuit.*

[2] *Ei intra animum suum minus favere.*

suggest unto his passion, that Stanley at Bosworth-field, though he came time enough to save his life, yet he stayed long enough to endanger it. But yet having no matter against him, he continued him in his places until this his fall.

After him was made Lord Chamberlain Giles Lord Dawbeny, a man of great sufficiency and valour, the more[1] because he was gentle and moderate.

There was a common opinion, that Sir Robert Clifford (who now was becomen the state-informer) was from the beginning an emissary and spy of the King's; and that he fled over into Flanders with his consent and privity. But this is not probable; both because he never recovered that degree of grace which he had with the King before his going over; and chiefly for that the discovery which he had made touching the Lord Chamberlain (which was his great service) grew not from anything he learned abroad, for that he knew it well before he went.

These executions, and specially that of the Lord Chamberlain which was the chief strength of the party, and by means of Sir Robert Clifford who was the most inward man of trust amongst them, did extremely quail the design of Perkin and his complices, as well through discouragement as distrust. So that they were now like sand without lime; ill bound together; especially as many as were English, who were at a gaze, looking strange one upon another, not knowing who was faithful to their side; but thinking that the King (what with his baits and what with his nets) would draw them all unto him that were any thing

[1] *i. e.* qualities which were of the greater value because &c. *Quæ virtutes magis in eo enituerunt quod*, &c.

worth. And indeed it came to pass that divers came away by the thrid, sometimes one and sometimes another. Barley,[1] that was joint-commissioner with Clifford, did hold out one of the longest, till Perkin was far worn; yet made his peace at length.[2] But the fall of this great man, being in so high authority and favour (as was thought) with the King, and the manner of carriage of the business, as if[3] there had been secret inquisition upon him for a great time before; and the cause for which he suffered, which was little more than for saying in effect that the title of York was better than the title of Lancaster, which was the case almost of every man, at the least in opinion; was matter of great terror amongst all the King's servants and subjects; insomuch as no man almost thought himself secure, and men durst scarce commune or talk one with another, but there was a general diffidence everywhere; which nevertheless made the King rather more absolute than more safe.[4] For bleeding inwards and shut vapours strangle soonest and oppress most.

Hereupon presently came forth swarms and vollies of libels (which are the gusts of liberty of speech restrained, and the females of sedition,) containing bitter invectives and slanders against the King and some of the counsel: for the contriving and dispersing whereof (after great diligence of enquiry) five mean persons were caught up and executed.

Meanwhile the King did not neglect Ireland, being

[1] "William Barlee, alias Barley, of Aldebury (Herts), Esquire," received his pardon on 12 July, 1498. See Cal. Pat. Rolls, 13 Hen. VII. p. 39.

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "at the length."

[3] The Latin puts it more strongly. *Unde liquido patebat.*

[4] In the translation he says more absolute but *less* safe. *Ex quo factum est ut rex magis absoluto certe, sed minus tuto, imperio frueretur.*

the soil where these mushrooms and upstart weeds that spring up in a night did chiefly prosper. He sent therefore from hence (for the better settling of his affairs there) commissioners of both robes,[1] the Prior of Lanthony[2] to be his Chancellor in that kingdom,

[1] Sir Edward Poynings (or Ponynges), and "Henry, Prior of Langtony and Bishop elect of Bangor" received their commissions, — the one as "Deputy of Ireland, with power to act as Lieutenant in the absence of Henry, second son of the King;" the other as Chancellor, — on the 13th of September, 1494. See Cal. Pat. Rolls, 10 Hen. VII. p. 31. 36. On the same day, Sir Robert Poyntz was commissioned "to superintend the muster of the King's troops destined for Ireland, and to ship them in certain vessels at Bristol thereto appointed." Id. ibid. p. 81.

I suspect that Bacon's description of Sir Edward Poynings's commission, which does not agree exactly with the description in the Calendar of Patent Rolls, was drawn from the tenor of the previous commission to James Ormond and Thomas Garth, 6th December, 1491. See note 3, p. 206. At that time the Duke of Bedford was Lieutenant of Ireland; who was Deputy in his absence I do not know; but on the 11th of June, 1492, Walter Archbishop of Dublin was appointed to that office. See Cal. Pat. Rolls.

The statement that the Earl of Kildare *was Deputy* when Poynings was sent over, that he was apprehended, sent to England, cleared himself, and *was replaced*, comes from Polydore Vergil: whose dates are not much to be relied upon. It is true however that the Earl was attainted by Poinings's Parliament, 1 Dec. 1494, and that the attainder was reversed by Parliament in England in October, 1495. See *Stat. of Realm*, vol. ii. p. 612. The entries in the Calendar of Patent Rolls would lead one to suspect that Sir Edward Poynings discharged the office of Deputy till the end of 1495; that he was then succeeded (provisionally perhaps) by the Prior of Lanthony, who was still Chancellor, and whose appointment as "Deputy and Justice of Ireland, during the absence of Henry, the King's son," &c. is dated 1 Jan. 1495-6 (see Cal. Pat. Rolls, 11 Hen. VII. p. 25); that he continued to discharge both offices till the 6th August, 1496, when he was succeeded as Chancellor by Walter Archbishop of Dublin, and as Deputy by Gerald Fitz Moryce, Earl of Kildare, to whom that office, with the same privileges, &c. as Sir Edward Poynings had enjoyed in the same, was then granted for ten years, and afterwards during pleasure. See Cal. Pat. Rolls, 11 Hen. VII. pt. 1. p. 25. and pt. 2. pp. 15. 18. It may be worth mentioning that Gerald Earl of Kildare had previously received a general pardon on the 30th of March, 1493. Cal. Pat. Rolls, 8 Hen. VII. p. 81.

[2] Henry Dene, now bishop elect of Bangor; translated to Salisbury in

and Sir Edward Poynings, with a power of men, and a marshall commission, together with a civil power of his Lieutenant,[1] with a clause, That the Earl of Kildare, then Deputy, should obey him. But the wild Irish, who were the principal offenders, fled into the woods and bogs, after their manner; and those that knew themselves guilty in the pale fled to them. So that Sir Edward Poynings was enforced to make a wild chase upon the wild Irish; where (in respect of the mountains and fastnesses) he did little good: which (either out of a suspicious melancholy upon his bad success, or the better to save his service from disgrace,) he would needs impute unto the comfort that the rebels should receive underhand from the Earl of Kildare; every light suspicion growing upon the Earl, in respect of the Kildare that was in the action of Lambert Symnell, and slain at Stokefield. Wherefore he caused the Earl to be apprehended, and sent into England; where upon examination he cleared himself so well as he was replaced in his government. But Poynings, the better to make compensation of the meagreness of his service in the wars by acts of peace, called a Parliament; where was made that memorable act which at this day is called Poynings' Law; whereby all the statutes of England were made to be of force in Ireland. For before they were not; neither are any now in force in Ireland, which were made in England since that time; which was the tenth year of the King.

1500; and to Canterbury in August, 1501, upon the death of Cardinal Morton. Died 16 Feb. 1502–3. See old Chron. 204. *b*.

[1] *Atque una diploma dedit auctoritatem in eum conferens locumtenentis sui in regimine civili.* This is not expressly stated by Polydore, though his narrative seems to imply as much.

About this time began to be discovered in the King that disposition, which afterwards nourished and whet on by bad counsellors and ministers proved the blot of his times: which was the course he took to crush treasure out of his subjects' purses, by forfeitures upon penal laws. At this men did startle the more (at this time), because it appeared plainly to be in the King's nature, and not out of his necessity; he being now in float for treasure: for that he had newly received the peace-money from France, the benevolence-money from his subjects, and great casualties upon the confiscations of the Lord Chamberlain and divers others. The first noted case of this kind was that of Sir William Capel,[1] Alderman of London; who upon sundry penal laws was condemned in the sum of seven and twenty hundred pounds, and compounded with the King for sixteen hundred: and yet after, Empson would have cut another chop out of him, if the King had not died in the instant.

The summer following,[2] the King, to comfort his mother, whom he did always tenderly love and revere, and to make demonstration[3] to the world that the proceeding against Sir William Stanley (which was imposed upon him by necessity of state) had not in any

[1] This fact is recorded by Stowe; without any remark. And it is worth observing that the predominance of avarice in Henry's character (which has since become almost proverbial, and to which our modern historians refer almost every action of his life,) had not been noticed by any historian before Bacon, except Speed; and he professes to have derived the observation from Bacon himself. This case occurred in May, 1495. See old Chron. Sir William Capell received a pardon on the 7th Nov. following. See Cal. Pat. Rolls, 11 Hen. VII. p. 19.

[2] *i. e.* the summer of 1495: the 25th of June, according to Polydore.

[3] The MS. and the Ed. 1622 both have "to make open demonstration." In the list "faults escaped," at the end of the volume, "open" is directed to be omitted.

degree diminished the affection he bore to Thomas his brother, went in progress to Latham, to make merry with his mother and the Earl, and lay there divers days.

During this progress Perkin Warbeck, finding that time and temporising, which while his practices were covert and wrought well in England made for him, did now when they were discovered and defeated rather make against him (for that when matters once go down the hill they stay not without a new force), resolved to try his adventure in some exploit upon England; hoping still upon the affections of the common people towards the House of York. Which body of common people he thought was not to be practised upon as persons of quality are; but that the only practice upon their affections was to set up a standard in the field. The place where he should make his attempt he chose to be the coast of Kent.

The King by this time was grown to such a height of reputation for cunning and policy, that every accident and event that went well was laid and imputed to his foresight, as if he had set it before. As in this particular of Perkin's design upon Kent. For the world would not believe afterwards, but the King, having secret intelligence of Perkin's intention for Kent, the better to draw it on, went of purpose into the north afar off; laying an open side unto Perkin to make him come to the close, and so to trip up his heels, having made sure in Kent beforehand.

But so it was, that Perkin had gathered together a power of all nations,[1] neither in number nor in the hardiness and courage of the persons contemptible;

[1] *Colluviem quandam.*

but in their nature and fortunes to be feared as well of friends as enemies; being bankrupts, and many of them felons, and such as lived by rapine. These he put to sea, and arrived upon the coast of Sandwich and Deal in Kent about July.[1]

There he cast anchor, and to prove the affections of the people, sent some of his men to land, making great boasts of the power that was to follow. The Kentish men, perceiving that Perkin was not followed by any English of name or account, and that his forces consisted but of strangers born, and most of them base people and free-booters, fitter to spoil a coast than to recover a kingdom; resorting unto the principal gentlemen of the country, professed their loyalty to the King, and desired to be directed and commanded for the best of the King's service. The gentlemen, entering into consultation, directed some forces in good number to shew themselves upon the coast, and some of them to make signs to entice Perkin's soldiers to land, as if they would join with them; and some others to appear from some other places, and to make semblance as if they fled from them, the better to encourage them to land. But Perkin, who by playing the Prince, or else taught by secretary Frion, had learned thus much, that people under command do use to consult and after to march on in order,[2] and rebels contrariwise run upon an head together in confusion; considering the delay of time, and observing their orderly and not tumultuary arming, doubted the worst. And therefore the wily youth would not set one foot

[1] On the 3rd of July, 1495; according to the old Chronicle, p. 154. *b.*

[2] *Primo stare et postea ordine incedere.* Ed. 1622 has "to march in order."

out of his ship, till he might see things were sure. Wherefore the King's forces, perceiving that they could draw on no more than those that were formerly landed, set upon them and cut them in pieces ere they could fly back to their ships. In which skirmish (besides those that fled and were slain) there were taken about an hundred and fifty persons, which, for that the King thought, that to punish a few for example was gentleman's pay, but for rascal people they were to be cut off every man, especially in the beginning of an enterprise; and likewise for that he saw that Perkin's forces would now consist chiefly of such rabble and scum of desperate people;[1] he therefore[2] hanged them all for the greater terror. They were brought to London all railed in ropes, like a team of horses in a cart, and were executed some of them at London and Wapping, and the rest at divers places upon the sea-coast of Kent, Sussex, and Norfolk; for sea-marks or lighthouses to teach Perkin's people to avoid the coast. The King being advertised of the landing of the rebels, thought to leave his progress: but being certified the next day that they were partly defeated and partly fled, he continued his progress, and sent Sir Richard Guildford into Kent in message; who calling the country together, did much commend (from the King) their fidelity, manhood, and well handling of that service; and gave them all thanks, and in private promised reward to some particulars.

Upon the sixteenth of November (this being the eleventh year of the King) was holden the Serjeants'

[1] *Simulque animo prospiciens copias Perkini posthac ex colluvie et sentinâ hominum projectorum compositas fore.*

[2] So Ed. 1622. The MS. omits "he therefore."

feast at Ely Place, there being nine serjeants of that call. The King, to honour the feast, was present with his Queen at the dinner; being a Prince that was ever ready to grace and countenance the professors of the law; having a little of that, that as he governed his subjects by his[1] laws, so he governed his laws by his lawyers.

This year also the King entered into league with the Italian potentates for the defence of Italy against France. For King Charles had conquered the realm of Naples, and lost it again, in a kind of felicity of a dream. He passed the whole length of Italy without resistance; so that it was true which Pope Alexander was wont to say, That the Frenchmen came into Italy with chalk in their hands to mark up their lodgings, rather than with swords to fight. He likewise entered and won in effect the whole kingdom of Naples itself, without striking stroke. But presently thereupon he did commit and multiply so many errors, as was too great a task for the best fortune to overcome. He gave no contentment to the barons of Naples, of the faction of the Angeovines; but scattered his rewards according to the mercenary appetites of some about him: He put all Italy upon their guard, by the seizing and holding of Ostia, and the protecting of the liberty of Pisa; which made all men suspect that his purposes looked further than his title of Naples: He fell too soon at difference with Ludovico Sfortza, who was the man that carried the keys which brought him in and shut him out: He neglected to extinguish some relicks of the war: And lastly, in regard of his easy passage through Italy without resistance, he entered

[1] So Ed. 1622. The MS. omits "his."

into an overmuch despising of the arms of the Italians, whereby he left the realm of Naples at his departure so much the less provided. So that not long after his return, the whole kingdom revolted to Ferdinando the younger, and the French were quite driven out. Nevertheless Charles did make both great threats and great preparations to re-enter Italy once again: wherefore at the instance of divers of the states of Italy (and especially of Pope Alexander) there was a league concluded between the said Pope, Maximilian King of the Romans, Henry King of England, Ferdinando and Isabella King and Queen of Spain (for so they are constantly placed in the original treaty throughout), Augustino Barbadico Duke of Venice, and Ludovico Sfortza Duke of Milan, for the common defence of their estates: wherein though Ferdinando of Naples was not named as principal, yet no doubt the kingdom of Naples was tacitly included[1] as a fee of the church.

There died also this year Cecile Duchess of York, mother to King Edward the Fourth, at her castle of Barkhamsted, being of extreme years, and who had lived to see three princes of her body crowned, and four murdered. She was buried at Foderingham, by her husband.

This year also the King called his Parliament,[2] where many laws were made of a more private and vulgar nature than ought to detain the reader of an history. And it may be justly suspected, by the pro-

[1] *Tacitly* is omitted in the translation. The original league (without Henry) was signed 25 March, 1495. It was ratified by Henry on the 13th of September, 1496.

[2] It met on the 14th of October, 1495.

gave the attaint upon a false verdict between party and party,[1] which before was a kind of evangile, irremediable. It extends not to causes capital, as well because they are for the most part at the King's suit; as because in them, if they be followed in course of indictment,[2] there passeth a double jury, the indictors and the triers, and so not twelve men but four and twenty. But it seemeth that was not the only reason; for this reason holdeth not in the appeal.[3] But the great reason was, lest it should tend to the discouragement of jurors in cases of life and death, if they should be subject to suit and penalty, where the favour of life maketh against them. It extendeth not also to any suit where the demand is under the value of forty pounds; for that in such cases of petty value it would not quit the charge to go about again.[4]

There was another law made against a branch of ingratitude in women, who having been advanced[5] by their husbands, or their husbands' ancestors, should alien and thereby seek to defeat the heirs or those in remainder of the lands whereunto they had been so advanced. The remedy was by giving power to the next to enter for a forfeiture.[6]

There was also enacted that charitable law for the admission of poor suitors *in forma pauperis*, without

[1] *Quæ breve de attinctâ vocatum introduxit; per quod judicia juratorum (quæ veredicta vocantur) falsa rescindi possint.* 11 H. 7. c. 21.

[2] *Si per viam indictamenti, quod regis nomine semper procedit, tractentur.*

[3] *Ubi causa capitalis a parte gravata peragitur.*

[4] *Superaturæ essent impensæ summam principalem si retractarentur.* The entire sum at issue would not pay the expense of the process.

[5] *i e.* received lands: *ad terras promotæ.*

[6] *In terrarum possessionem, nomine forisfacturæ, non expectata morte mulieris, continuo venire.* 11 H. 7. c. 20.

fee to counsellor, attorney, or clerk; whereby poor men became rather able to vex than unable to sue.[1] There were divers other good laws made that Parliament, as we said before; but we still observe our manner in selecting out those that are not of a vulgar nature.

The King this while though he sat in Parliament as in full peace, and seemed to account of the designs of Perkin (who was now returned into Flanders) but as of a May-game;[2] yet having the composition of a wise King, stout without and apprehensive within, had given order for the watching of beacons upon the coast, and erecting more where they stood too thin; and had a careful eye where this wandering cloud would break. But Perkin, advised to keep his fire (which hitherto burned as it were upon green wood) alive with continual blowing, sailed again into Ireland;[3] whence he had formerly departed, rather upon the hopes of France than upon any unreadiness or discouragement he found in that people. But in the space of time between, the King's diligence and Poyning's commission had so settled things there, as there

[1] *Unde tamen factum est ut homines egeni, sicut lege experiri melius possent, ad alios vexandos promptiores essent.* The meaning is, that the charity of the legislature thought it better that the poor man should be able to vex than that he should not be able to sue. — This was 11 H. 7. c. 12.

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "but as a May-game."

[3] Probably soon after the failure of his descent upon Kent. For we hear of a royal fleet under the command of Sir Roger Cotton destined for Ireland on the 26th of July, 1495 (Cal. Pat. Rolls, 10 Hen. VII. p. 97.); and on the 26th of November following, license was granted to the owner of a ship which had been seized and despoiled *at Youghal by the rebel Peter Warbeck*, to seize or detain any ship or goods, &c. (Id. 11 Hen. VII. p. 18. A.) A letter from Yarmouth, in the Paston Correspondence (v. p. 431.), dated 'Relyk Sonday' [12 July, 1495], says "as for the ships with the King's rebellers they be forth out of Cambyr *westwards*."

was nothing left for Perkin but the blustering affection of the wild[1] and naked people. Wherefore he was advised by his counsel to seek aid of the King of Scotland; a Prince young and valorous, and in good terms with his nobles and people, and ill affected to King Henry. At this time also both Maximilian and Charles of France began to bear no good will to the King: the one being displeased with the King's prohibition of commerce with Flanders; the other holding the King for suspect, in regard of his late entry into league with the Italians. Wherefore besides the open aids of the Duchess of Burgundy, which did with sails and oars put on and advance Perkin's designs, there wanted not some secret tides from Maximilian and Charles which did further his fortunes; insomuch as they both by their secret letters and messages recommended him to the King of Scotland.

Perkin therefore coming into Scotland[2] upon those hopes, with a well-appointed company, was by the King of Scots (being formerly well prepared) honourably welcomed; and soon after his arrival admitted to his presence in a solemn manner. For the King received him in state in his chamber of presence, accompanied with divers of his nobles. And Perkin,

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "of wild."

[2] He arrived in Stirling on the 20th of November, 1495. But the King of Scotland had been prepared to receive him more than a year before. See the entry in the Treasurer's books, Nov. 6, 1494, quoted by Tytler. "Items for carriage of the arras work forth of Edinburgh to Stirling, for receiving the Prince of England, xxx. *sh.*" This may have been the occasion of the busy deliberations in the English Council mentioned in one of the Paston letters, dated Allhallowtide, 1494. "Sir, there hath been so great counsel for the King's matters that my Lord Chancellor kept not the Star Chamber this eight days, but one day at London, on St. Leonard's day." Vol. v. p. 423.

well attended as well with those that the King had sent before him as with his own train, entered the room where the King was, and coming near to the King, and bowing a little to embrace him, he retired some paces back, and with a loud voice, that all that were present might hear him, made his declaration in this manner:[1]

"High and mighty King; your Grace and these your nobles here present may be pleased benignly to bow your ears to hear the tragedy of a young man, that by right ought to hold in his hand the ball of a kingdom, but by fortune is made himself a ball, tossed from misery to misery, and from place to place. You see here before you the spectacle of a Plantagenet, who hath been carried from the nursery to the sanctu-

[1] It is not to be supposed that there is any authentic report of Perkin's speech to the Scotch King, except for the general tenor and effect of it. The speech which is given here is taken almost entirely from Speed; who seems to have made it up partly from Perkin's Proclamation (to be mentioned presently) and partly from the narrative of John Leslie Bishop of Rosse; with a touch here and there taken from Polydore Vergil. Speed gives it in the third person, as the substance of what Perkin said. Bacon retains all that is in Speed, almost word for word; interweaving here and there a sentence or two, apparently of his own, by way of introduction or transition; or to fill up an apparent gap in the argument. The three first sentences, and those in which Perkin is made to touch upon the manner of his escape from the Tower, may be taken as specimens of the matter added. I have not thought it worth while to point out each expression which varies from previously recorded versions of the speech. It is enough to say that no statement or material modification of any *fact* has been introduced by Bacon without the authority (such as it is) of preceding historians. In point of form and expression there is no version of it which has any claim to be taken for authentic. Such things, unless taken down by a short-hand writer, must always be in great part the composition of the narrator; as any one may satisfy himself by trying to write out a continuous narrative of the last conversation, or a continuous report of the last speech, that was uttered in his presence: and if the version of the speech which is here given contains Bacon's guesses, instead of Polydore's or Leslie's or Speed's, it is not the less likely on that account to represent truly the effect of what Perkin said.

ary, from the sanctuary to the direful prison, from the prison to the hand of the cruel tormentor, and from that hand to the wide wilderness (as I may truly call it), for so the world hath been to me. So that he that is born to a great kingdom, hath not ground to set his foot upon, more than this where he now standeth by your princely favour. Edward the Fourth, late King of England, (as your Grace cannot but have heard,) left two sons, Edward and Richard Duke of York, both very young. Edward the eldest succeeded their father in the crown, by the name of King Edward the Fifth. But Richard Duke of Glocester, their unnatural uncle, first thirsting after the kingdom through ambition, and afterwards thirsting for their blood out of desire to secure himself, employed an instrument of his (confident to him as he thought,) to murder them both. But this man that was employed to execute that execrable tragedy, having cruelly slain King Edward, the eldest of the two, was moved partly by remorse, and partly by some other mean, to save Richard his brother; making a report nevertheless to the tyrant that he had performed his commandment for both brethren. This report was accordingly believed,[1] and published generally. So that the world hath been possessed of an opinion that they both were barbarously made away, though ever truth hath some sparks that fly abroad until it appear in due time, as this hath had. But Almighty God, that stopped the mouth of the lions,[2] and saved little Joas from the tyranny of Athaliah when she massacred the King's

[1] Believed, that is, by Richard. *Isti relationi a tyranno fides adhibita est, eademque publicis declarationibus est confirmata.*

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "lion."

children, and did save Isaac when the hand was stretched forth to sacrifice him, preserved the second brother. For I myself that stand here in your presence, am that very Richard Duke of York, brother of that unfortunate Prince King Edward the Fifth, now the most rightful surviving heir-male to that victorious and most noble Edward, of that name the Fourth, late King of England. For the manner of my escape, it is fit it should pass in silence, or at least in a more secret relation; for that it may concern some alive, and the memory of some that are dead. Let it suffice to think, that I had then a mother living, a Queen, and one that expected daily such a commandment from the tyrant for the murdering of her children. Thus in my tender age escaping by God's mercy out of London, I was secretly conveyed over sea; where after a time the party that had me in charge (upon what new fears, change of mind, or practice, God knoweth) suddenly forsook me; whereby I was forced to wander abroad, and to seek mean conditions for the sustaining of my life. Wherefore distracted between several passions, the one of fear to be known, lest the tyrant should have a new attempt upon me, the other of grief and disdain to be unknown and to live in that base and servile manner that I did, I resolved with myself to expect the tyrant's death, and then to put myself into my sister's hands, who was next heir to the crown. But in this season it happened one Henry Tidder,[1] son to Edmund

[1] So spelt throughout Perkin's original proclamation; and in the MS. and original edition of this work.

The sentences which follow, down to the words "if I had been such a feigned person," are taken almost verbatim from Speed, by whom they were copied almost verbatim from the first paragraph of Perkin's procla-

Tidder Earl of Richmond, to come from France and enter into the realm, and by subtile and foul means to obtain the crown of the same, which to me rightfully appertained: so that it was but a change from tyrant to tyrant. This Henry, my extreme and mortal enemy, so soon as he had knowledge of my being alive, imagined and wrought all the subtile ways and means he could to procure my final destruction. For my mortal enemy hath not only falsely surmised me to be a feigned person, giving me nick-names so abusing the world; but also to defer and put me from entry into England, hath offered large sums of money to corrupt the Princes and their ministers with whom I have been retained; and made importune labours to certain servants about my person to murder or poison me,[1] and others to forsake and leave my righteous quarrel and to depart from my service; as Sir Robert Clifford and others. So that every man of reason may well perceive, that Henry, calling himself King of England, needed not to have bestowed such great sums of treasure, nor so to have busied himself with importune and incessant labour and industry, to compass my death and ruin, if I had been such a feigned person. But the truth of my cause being so manifest, moved the most Christian King Charles, and the Lady Duchess Dowager of Burgundy, my most dear aunt, not only to acknowledge the truth thereof, but lovingly to assist

mation. The discrepancies between Speed's extract and the original (presuming that the copy of the original which has been preserved is correct) seem to have arisen from the difficulty of decyphering it.

The remainder of the speech is also taken — with no more change than the turning it from the third person into the first, and the insertion of a transitional sentence — from Speed; who took it from Bishop Leslie.

[1] So Speed. The MS. copy has "some of them to murdere our psone, us (*sic*) and other to forsack," &c.

me. But it seemeth that God above, for the good of this whole island, and the knitting of these two kingdoms of England and Scotland in a strait concord and amity by so great an obligation, hath reserved the placing of me in the imperial throne of England for the arms and succours of your Grace. Neither is it the first time that a King of Scotland hath supported them that were reft[1] and spoiled of the kingdom of England, as of late in fresh memory it was done in the person of Henry the Sixth. Wherefore for that your Grace hath given clear signs that you are in no noble quality inferior to your royal ancestors, I, so distressed a Prince, was hereby moved to come and put myself into your royal hands; desiring your assistance to recover my kingdom of England, promising faithfully to bear myself towards your Grace no otherwise than if I were your own natural brother; and will, upon the recovery of mine inheritance, gratefully do to you[2] all the pleasure that is in my utmost power."

After Perkin had told his tale, King James answered bravely and wisely, That whosoever he were, he should not repent him of putting himself into his hands. And from that time forth (though there wanted not some about him that would have persuaded him that all was but an illusion) yet notwithstanding, either taken by Perkin's amiable and alluring behaviour, or inclining to the recommendation of the great Princes abroad, or willing to take an occasion of a war against King Henry, he entertained him in all things as became the person of Richard Duke of York, em-

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "bereft."
[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "do you."

braced his quarrel, and, the more to put it out of doubt that he took him to be a great Prince and not a representation only, he gave consent that this Duke should take to wife the Lady Katheren Gordon daughter to the Earl of Huntley, being a near kinswoman to the King himself, and a young virgin of excellent beauty and virtue.

Not long after,[1] the King of Scots in person, with Perkin in his company, entered with a great army (though it consisted chiefly of borderers being raised somewhat suddenly) into Northumberland. And Perkin, for a perfume before him as he went, caused to be published a proclamation of this tenor following,[2] in

[1] All Bacon's authorities represented this predatory incursion of the Scotch as following close upon Perkin's arrival. And Fabyan, whose authority is good for dates, says that the Scotch King made sharp war upon the marches in the eleventh year; that is 1495–6. I find also in the Calendar of Patent Rolls several commissions for warlike preparations dated during that year: on the 18th of November, 1495, a commission of array for Yorkshire: on the 16th of March, 1495–6, a commission to impress carpenters, masons, &c. for the King's works on the northern parts and the marches towards Scotland: on the 23rd of April, commissions of muster and array for Sussex, Kent, Worcestershire, Lincolnshire, the cinque ports, Surrey, Hants, Derbyshire, and Staffordshire. (See Cal. Pat. Rolls, 11 Hen. VII. pp. 49. 51. 29–33.) It is probable therefore that some predatory incursions did take place soon after Perkin's arrival in Scotland. The principal invasion however of which Bacon proceeds to speak does not appear to have been made for ten months or more after. See Ellis's Letters, 1st ser. vol. i. pp. 23. 32.; and Tytler's Extracts from the Treasurer's Books.

The author of the Pictorial History of England puts it still later. He says that James did not cross the borders till the beginning of the winter of 1496, though he had been expected to do so as early as the middle of September. But he does not quote his authority. In the Calendar of Patent Rolls there are several commissions for the conveyance of various warlike stores towards Scotland dated in September, November, January, and February, 1496–7. And these were no doubt the preparations against the "great army" which the Scotch King led across the borders in person.

[2] Of this *tenor;* not in these *words.* This proclamation stands on a different footing from the speech in the last page; and I have therefore

the name of Richard Duke of York, true inheritor of the crown of England:

"It hath pleased God, who putteth down the mighty from their seat, and exalteth the humble, and suffereth not the hopes of the just to perish in the end, to give us means at the length to show ourselves armed unto our lieges and people of England. But far be it from us to intend

The original of this proclamation remaineth with Sir Robert Cotton, a worthy preserver and treasurer of rare antiquities: from whose manuscripts I have had much light for the furnishing of this work.

treated it differently. Of this there is extant a literal copy; not indeed the original copy of which Bacon speaks as then remaining with Sir Robert Cotton; but a transcript in a well-known hand, with the following note prefixed by the transcriber himself. "The original of this, in old written hand, is in the hands of Sir Robert Cotton, the 18 of August, 1616." That original (which, to judge by the many confused and scarcely intelligible passages that occur in the copy, was probably either very incorrect or very hard to read) is not now to be found: but the transcript may be seen among the Harleian MSS. No. 283. fo. 123. *b*.

Bacon's manner of treating it is peculiar, and (for modern readers at least) requires explanation. It seems that he had read the original and remembered its tenor, but had no copy within reach from which he could quote the words. Speed however had printed some extracts from it; and all these he has quoted almost verbatim, — with only the occasional substitution of a familiar for an obsolete word. Of the rest he has given, not a transcript, but a *representation;* the sort of representation which a clear-headed reporter will give of a confused message, or a judge of the evidence of a blundering witness. The spirit and effect he has preserved faithfully; but he has omitted repetitions, changed the order, marked the transitions, and in some cases inserted a sentence or two to make the meaning clearer or more forcible.

Now if he had treated the extracts which he found in Speed in the same way as the rest, one could only have supposed that he had done it in obedience to some law of historical composition, — because a literal transcript of such a thing could not have been introduced into his work with a good effect. But since this is not so; since he has made so very little alteration in those portions of which he certainly had an exact copy at hand, and so very much in all the rest; the only natural inference is that though he had read the original and remembered well enough its general character and purport, he had no copy of the words within reach, and either had not the means or did not think it worth while to procure one.

I have pointed out in the foot-notes the principal passages in which Bacon's representation varies from the real proclamation; and a copy of the proclamation itself will be found in the appendix.

their hurt or damage, or to make war upon them, otherwise than to deliver ourself and them from tyranny and oppression. For our mortal enemy Henry Tidder, a false usurper of the crown of England which to us by natural and lineal right appertaineth, knowing in his own heart our undoubted right, (we being the very Richard Duke of York, younger son and now surviving heir-male of the noble and victorious Edward the Fourth, late King of England), hath not only deprived us of our kingdom, but likewise by all foul and wicked means sought to betray us and bereave us of our life. Yet if his tyranny only extended itself to our person, (although our royal blood teacheth us to be sensible of injuries,) it should be less to our grief. But this Tidder, who boasteth himself to have overthrown a tyrant, hath ever since his first entrance into his usurped reign, put little in practice but tyranny and the feats thereof.[1] For King Richard, our unnatural uncle, (although desire of rule did blind him) yet in his other actions, like a true Plantagenet, was noble, and loved the honour of the realm and the contentment and comfort of his nobles and people. But this our mortal enemy, agreeable to the meanness of his birth, hath trodden under foot the honour of this nation; selling our best confederates for money, and making merchandise of the blood, estates, and fortunes of our peers and subjects, by feigned wars and dishonourable peace, only to enrich his coffers.[2] Nor

[1] This first paragraph is a kind of abstract of the first page and half of the real proclamation; of which the words, or a great part of them, have already been given (from Speed) as part of Perkin's speech to the King. The substance of them is here recast in quite a different form.

[2] I cannot find any passage in the real proclamation in which any such allusion to the recent peace is contained, either explicitly or implicitly. I *fancy that*, in this instance, Bacon's memory, endeavouring to recover its

unlike hath been his hateful misgovernment and evil deportments here at home. First he hath to fortify his false quarrel[1] caused divers nobles of this our realm (whom he held suspect and stood in dread of) to be cruelly murdered; as our cousin Sir William Stanley Lord Chamberlain,[2] Sir Simon[3] Mountfort, Sir Robert Ratcliffe, William Dawbeney, Humphrey Stafford, and many others, besides such as have dearly bought their lives with intolerable ransoms: some of which nobles are now in the sanctuary. Also he hath long kept, and yet keepeth in prison, our right entirely well-beloved cousin, Edward, son and heir to our uncle Duke of Clarence, and others; withholding from them their

impression of the original, — an impression derived perhaps from a single reading of an inaccurate and illegible manuscript — mistook a suggestion of his own for a recollection of what he had seen there. His thought as he read had outrun his eye. He had seen the sort of topics which Perkin was looking for; that topic had at once presented itself to his mind; and it remained afterwards in his memory so associated with the passage, that he forgot it was not a part of it. In men of quick faculties and large memories largely tasked, there is no kind of error of memory so common as this. Indeed I suppose there is hardly any man who, if he make a point of referring distinctly to his authorities and verifying his references, will not find himself occasionally turning for his authority with the greatest confidence to a place where no such thing is to be found. The value of Bacon's testimony to matters of fact (which I hold very high) depends not upon any particular faculty for remembering details, — for his references and quotations are often inaccurate, — but upon the capacity and the habit, far more important to substantial accuracy than the most impeccable memory, of taking true impressions in the first instance.

[1] The rest of this and the following paragraph are taken word for word from Speed; who copied them word for word (with a very few differences probably accidental and two or three omissions indicated by *et cœteras*) from Sir Robert Cotton's MS.

[2] So Speed. The MS. copy of the proclamation has "*our cousin the Lord Fitzwater*, Sir William Stanley, Sir Robert Chamberlain, &c." Lord Fitzwater was beheaded at Calais, according to the old Chronicle, fo. 161. b. in November, 1496; after the date which Bacon would have assigned to the proclamation.

[3] So Ed. 1622. The MS. has "Edmond."

rightful inheritance, to the intent they should never be of might and power to aid and assist us at our need, after the duty of their legiances. He also married by compulsion certain of our sisters, and also the sister of our said cousin the Earl of Warwick, and divers other ladies of the royal blood, unto certain of his kinsmen and friends of simple and low degree; and, putting apart all well disposed nobles, he hath none in favour and trust about his person, but Bishop Foxe, Smith, Bray, Lovel, Oliver King,[1] David Owen, Riseley, Turbervile,[2] Tyler,[3] Cholmeley, Empson,[4] James Hobarte, John Cutte, Garth, Henry Wyate, and such other caitifs and villains of birth,[5] which by subtile inventions and pilling of the people have been the principal finders, occasioners, and counsellors of the misrule and mischief now reigning in England.[6]

"We remembering these premises, with the great and execrable offences daily committed and done by our foresaid great enemy and his adherents, in break-

[1] The name of *Sir Charles Somerset*, which follows that of Oliver King both in Speed and in the MS. proclamation, has been omitted, I suppose by accident.

[2] The MS. proclamation has *Sir Joseph Trobulvill:* Speed gives *Sir John Trobutuile.* Sir John Turbervile is the name given in the Calendar of Patent Rolls.

[3] After the name of *Tyler* there follow in the MS. proclamation the names *Robert Lytton, Gylforde;* — they are omitted by Speed.

[4] The name of *Empson* is given in the MS. proclamation, but *not* in Speed: a circumstance worth observing, because we must suppose that Bacon supplied the omission from his recollection of the original; the name of Empson being too notable a one in connexion with Henry VII. to be overlooked.

[5] So Speed. The MS. proclamation has *villains of simple birth.*

[6] Here Speed inserts *etc.* to mark the omission of a long clause which follows in the original. It relates to the reward offered for the taking of Henry, and the substance of it will be found a little further on, — in the last paragraph but one.

ing the liberties and franchises of our mother the holy church, upon pretences of wicked and heathenish policy, to the high displeasure of Almighty God, besides the manifold treasons, abominable murders, manslaughters, robberies, extortions, the daily pilling of the people by dismes, taskes, tallages, benevolences, and other unlawful impositions and grievous exactions, with many other hainous effects,[1] to the likely destruction and desolation of the whole realm:[2] shall by God's grace, and the help and assistance of the great lords of our blood, with the counsel of other sad persons,[3] see that the commodities of our realm be employed to the most advantage of the same; the intercourse of merchandise betwixt realm and realm to be ministered and handled as shall more be to the common weal and prosperity of our subjects; and all such dismes, taskes, tallages, benevolences, unlawful impositions, and grievous exactions as be above rehearsed, to be foredone and laid apart, and never from henceforth to be called upon, but in such cases as our noble progenitors Kings of England have of old time been accustomed to have the aid, succour, and help of their subjects and true liege-men.[4]

[1] So Speed. The MS. proclamation has "offences;" which is probably the right word.

[2] Here Speed inserts an *&c.*; a few lines being omitted.

[3] Here again Speed inserts an *&c.*; a passage being omitted of some length, the substance of which Bacon has worked up into the following paragraph.

[4] This is the end of Speed's extract; who gives no more. The three remaining paragraphs appear to have been supplied by Bacon from memory: and contain the substance of all the rest. He has made no attempt (or else an unsuccessful one) to preserve the form and order of the real proclamation; but upon a careful comparison of the two I have not been able to find anything material here which is not implied in the original, or anything material in the original which is not expressed here.

"And farther we do out of our grace and clemency hereby as well publish and promise to all our subjects remission and free pardon of all by-past offences whatsoever against our person or estate, in adhering to our said enemy, by whom we know well they have been misled; if they shall within time convenient submit themselves unto us. And for such as shall come with the foremost to assist our righteous quarrel, we shall make them so far partakers of our princely favour and bounty, as shall be highly for the comfort of them and theirs both during their life and after their death. As also we shall, by all means which God shall put into our hands, demean ourselves to give royal contentment to all degrees and estates of our people; maintaining the liberties of holy church in their entire, preserving the honours, privileges, and preeminences of our nobles from contempt or disparagement, according to the dignity of their blood: we shall also unyoke our people from all heavy burdens and endurances, and confirm our cities, boroughs, and towns in their charters and freedoms, with enlargement where it shall be deserved; and in all points give our subjects cause to think that the blessed and debonaire government of our noble father King Edward in his last times is in us revived.

"And forasmuch as the putting to death or taking alive of our said mortal enemy may be a mean to stay much effusion of blood, which otherwise may ensue if by compulsion or fair promises he shall draw after him any number of our subjects to resist us; which we desire to avoid (though we be certainly informed that our said enemy is purposed and prepared to fly the land, having already made over great masses of the treasure of our crown the better to support him in foreign

parts); we do hereby declare that whosoever shall take or distress our said enemy, though the party be of never so mean a condition, he shall be by us rewarded with 1000*l.* in money, forthwith to be laid down to him, and an hundred marks by the year of inheritance; besides that he may otherwise merit, both toward God and all good people, for the destruction of such a tyrant.

"Lastly, we do all men to wit (and herein we take also God to witness) that whereas God hath moved the heart of our dearest cousin the King of Scotland to aid us in person in this our righteous quarrel, that it is altogether without any pact or promise, or so much as demand, of any thing that may prejudice our crown or subjects; but contrariwise with promise on our said cousin's part, that whensoever he shall find us in sufficient strength to get the upper hand of our enemy (which we hope will be very suddenly), he will forthwith peaceably return into his own kingdom, contenting himself only with the glory of so honourable an enterprise, and our true and faithful love and amity: which we shall ever by the grace of Almighty God so order as shall be to the great comfort of both kingdoms."

But Perkin's proclamation did little edify with the people of England. Neither was he the better welcome for the company he came in. Wherefore the King of Scotland, seeing none came in to Perkin nor none stirred any where in his favour, turned his enterprise into a rode;[1] and wasted and destroyed the

[1] Spelt "road" in MS.—James's preparations seem to have been complete by the middle of September, 1496; but he waited, I suppose, for the promised rising of the English in Perkin's favour. Henry in the meantime was informed by his friends in the Scotch Court of everything that

country of Northumberland with fire and sword. But hearing that there were forces coming against him, and not willing that they should find his men heavy and laden with booty, he returned into Scotland with great spoils, deferring further prosecution till another time. It is said that Perkin, acting the part of a prince handsomely, when he saw the Scottish fell to waste the country, came to the King in a passionate manner, making great lamentation, and desired that that might not be the manner of making the war; for that no crown was so dear to his mind, as that he desired to purchase it with the blood and ruin of his country. Whereunto the King answered half in sport, that he doubted much he was careful for that that was none of his; and that he should be too good a steward for his enemy, to save the country to his use.[1]

By this time, being the eleventh year of the King, the interruption of trade between the English and the Flemish began to pinch the merchants of both nations very sore, which moved them by all means they could devise to affect and dispose their sovereigns respectively to open the intercourse again. Wherein time favoured them. For the Archduke and his counsel began to see that Perkin would prove but a runagate and citizen of the world; and that it was the part of children to fall out about babies.[2] And the King on his part, after the attempts upon Kent and Northumberland,[3] began to

was going on: and knew that he was secure against any serious impression from that side. Whether he was prepared for this kind of predatory incursion or not, seems to be doubtful.

[1] This, and most of the particulars of Perkin's proceedings in Scotland, may be found in Buchanan. See *Rer. Scot. Hist.* XIII. 10, et seq.

[2] *Pupas: i. e.* dolls. So in Macbeth: "the *baby* of a girl."

[3] *Post impressiones illas in Cantium et Northumbriam factas et frustratas.* It is to be remembered however that the attempt upon *Northumberland*

have the business of Perkin in less estimation; so as he did not put it to account in any consultation of state. But that that moved him most was, that being a King that loved wealth and treasure, he could not endure to have trade sick, nor any obstruction to continue in the gate-vein, which disperseth that blood. And yet he kept state so far, as first to be sought unto. Wherein the Merchant Adventurers likewise being a strong company (at that time) and well under-set with rich men and good order,[1] did hold out bravely; taking off the commodities of the kingdom, though they lay dead upon their hands for want of vent. At the last, commissioners met at London to treat. On the King's part, Bishop Foxe Lord Privy Seal, Viscount Wells, Kendall Prior of Saint John's, and Warham Master of the Rolls (who began to gain much upon the King's opinion), and Urswick, who was almost every one, and Riseley. On the Archduke's part, the Lord Bevers his Admiral, the Lord Verunsell President of Flanders, and others. These concluded a perfect treaty[2]

had not yet been made. At the time Bacon is now speaking of, Perkin's fortunes at the Scotch Court were in full flower. See note 1. p. 250.

[1] *Magno locupletum numero et bonis contributionibus corroborata.*

[2] I find from the old Chronicle (Vitel. A. xvi. fo. 157. b.) that the Archduke's commissioners were received in London on Candlemas Even (1. Feb.) 1495–6: and that the treaty was concluded in the following April.

The Chronicler (evidently a contemporary citizen) adds a circumstance which is worth recording as an illustration of the relation which subsisted between the King and the City of London.

"For the assurance of the same," he says speaking of the treaty, "above and beside both the seals of either princes was granted divers towns of this land to be bound; whereof London was one; . . . . which sealing when it should have been performed, the Commons of the City would not be agreeable that their seal should pass. And albeit that my Lord of Derby, the Lord Treasurer, the Chief Justice of England, Master Bray, and the Master of the Rolls, by the King's commandment came unto Guildhall to exhort the said Commons for the same, yet in no wise they

both of amity and intercourse between the King and the Archduke; containing articles both of state, commerce, and free fishing. This is that treaty which the Flemings call at this day *intercursus magnus;* both because it is more complete than the precedent treaties of the third and fourth year of the King; and chiefly to give it a difference from the treaty that followed in the one and twentieth year of the King, which they call *intercursus malus.* In this treaty there was an express article against the reception of the rebels of either prince by other; purporting that if any such rebel should be required by the prince whose rebel he was of the prince confederate, that forthwith the prince confederate should by proclamation command him to avoid his country: which if he did not within fifteen days, the rebel was to stand proscribed, and put out of protection. But nevertheless in this article Perkin was not named, neither perhaps contained, because he was no rebel. But by this means his wings were clipt of his followers that were English. And it was expressly comprised in the treaty, that it should extend to the territories of the Duchess Dowager. After the intercourse thus restored, the English merchants came again to their mansion at Antwerp, where they were received with procession and great joy.

The winter following, being the twelfth year of his reign, the King called again his Parliament;[1] where

would not be agreeable that the town seal should pass; but besought the said Lords to grant unto them respite of six days, trusting by that season to show in writing such considerations unto the King's Grace and his Counsel that his Grace should be therewith well contented. Which was to them granted, and thereupon divers bills were devised," &c. The end was that the *Mayor's* seal was taken only.

[1] So Polydore Vergil: *coacto principum concilio.*

A Parliament met on the 16th of January, 1496–7, in which supplies

he did much exaggerate both the malice and the cruel predatory war lately made by the King of Scot-

were voted for the Scottish war. But on this, as on the two former occasions already mentioned, Henry had taken the precaution to call a "Great Council" first. He seems to have been in no hurry, and it is probable that he waited purposely until some overt act of hostility on the part of the Scotch should excite the alarm or exasperate the resentment of his own people, and make them less careful of their money. It is certain that on the 8th of September one of his spies in the Scotch Court sent him word that James would be upon the borders at the head of his army on the 15th, and that before the end of the following month, a Great Council had been held and agreed to a grant of 120,000*l.* for defence against the Scots.

"In this year" (says the old Chronicle, meaning the 12th year of Henry's reign,—*i. e.* 22 Aug. 1496—21 Aug. 1497) "the 24th of October, began a Great Counsel holden at Westminster by the King and his Lords spiritual and temporal; to the which Counsel come certain burgesses and merchants of all cities and good towns of England; at which Counsel was granted unto the King for the defence of the Scots 120,000*l.*: which Counsel ended the 6th day of November."

In addition to this "grant," as the Chronicler calls it,—(which was no more, I suppose, than a pledge on the part of the members of the Council to support such a grant if proposed in Parliament)—they appear to have offered in the meantime to *lend* the King large sums of ready money, each for himself; and to have advised the borrowing of money upon privy seals, to the amount of 40,000*l.* more. This circumstance (of which, singularly enough, no trace appears in any of our histories) is proved beyond dispute by an original Privy Seal bearing Henry the 7th's sign manual, and dated at Westminster on the 1st of December; which is still preserved among the Cotton MSS. (Titus, B. V. fo. 145.) It is addressed to a gentleman of Hereford and the sum applied for is 20*l.* But blank spaces have been left for the county and the sum; which shows that it was a general form. It sets forth that "for the revenging of the great cruelty and dishonour that the King of Scots hath done unto us, our realm, and subjects of the same, as our Commissioners in our County of Hereford where ye be inhabited shall shew unto you at length, we lately in our Great Counsel of Lords spiritual and temporal, of Judges, Sergeants in our law, and of others some headwisemen of every city and good town of this our land, have at their instances and by their advices determined us to make by sea and by land two armies royal for a substantial war to be continued upon the Scots unto such time as we shall invade the realm of Scotland in our own person and shall have with God's grace revenged their great outrages done unto us our realm and subjects aforesaid, so and in such wise as we trust the same our subjects shall live in rest and peace for many years to come. The lords and others of our said Great Counsel,

land: That that King, being in amity with him, and no ways provoked, should so burn in hatred towards him, as to drink of the lees and dregs of Perkin's

considering well that the said substantial war cannot be borne but by great sums of ready money, have prested unto us, every one of them for his part, great sums of money contented; besides that we have of ourself avanced out of our own coffers; yet natheless 40,000*l.* more, as our said Counsel hath cast it, must of necessity be borrowed and avanced in ready money of others our loving subjects for the furniture of this matter. And because as we hear ye be a man of good substance, we desire and pray you to make loan unto us of the sum of 20*l.* whereof ye shall be undoubtedly and assuredly repaid," &c. &c.

In confirmation again of this we find in the old Chronicle (fo. 161. b.) that "upon the Sunday following" [the 18th of November being the date last mentioned] "was sent from the King's ma. Sir Reginald Bray with other of the King's Counsel to the Mayor to borrow of the city 10,000*l.* And upon the Thursday next following was granted by a Common Counsel to lend to the King 4000*l.*" The Chronicler adds, a little further on (fo. 162. b.) that there was that year "lent unto the King for a year day throughout all England many and great sums of money, whereof the foresaid sum of 4000*l.* lent by the City of London, as before is said, was parcel of the same. The whole sum of all the land borrowed amounted to 58,000*l.* and more."

Among the records preserved in the Rolls-house are to be found two more of these privy seals (see B. V. 1. Nos. 32, 33.), as well as an account of all the sums borrowed (see B. V. 20.); amounting in all to £57,388 10*s.* 2*d.* This latter document is inaccurately described on the cover as an account of the *Benevolence*, A° H. 7. 12°. It should have been called *Loan.*

I have not been able to ascertain the exact period at which the Scotch incursion took place, but it seems probable that this hurried borrowing of money (partly for immediate use and partly perhaps as a collateral security for the promised Parliamentary grant) followed immediately upon it, while the alarm and resentment were fresh. Thus the King was provided with the sinews of war for the present and might act as he saw occasion. But as yet he was only furnished with money *lent*, which was to be repaid. The next thing was to secure the grant; and for this purpose a Parliament was called on the 16th of January, which granted him for the Scotch war, first two fifteenths and tenths; and then (because this was not enough) a subsidy *equal* to two fifteenths and tenths which it seems amounted to 120,000*l.* (See Stat. of Realm, p. 644.) In the "index vocabulorum" Bacon explains that a *Fifteen* was a kind of pecuniary aid granted only by authority of Parliament: which, to judge by the name, should be a fifteenth part of men's goods, but had in fact a fixed value,— not nearly so much: *Consuetudine in solutionem certam, et longe minus gravem, redactum.*

intoxication, who was every where else detected and discarded: and that when he perceived it was out of his reach to do the King any hurt, he had turned his arms upon unarmed and unprovided people, to spoil only and depopulate, contrary to the laws both of war and peace: concluding, that he could neither with honour nor with the safety of his people to whom he did owe protection, let pass these wrongs unrevenged. The Parliament understood him well, and gave him a subsidy limited to the sum[1] of one hundred and twenty thousand pounds, besides two fifteens: for his wars were always to him as a mine of treasure of a strange kind of ore;[2] iron at the top, and gold and silver at the bottom. At this[3] Parliament, for that there had been so much time spent in making laws the year before, and for that it was called purposely in respect of the Scottish war, there were no laws made to be remembered. Only there passed a law, at the suit of the Merchant Adventurers of England,[4] against the Merchant Adventurers of London, for monopolising and exacting upon the trade;[5] which it seemeth they did a little to save themselves, after the hard time they had sustained by want of trade. But those innovations were taken away by Parliament.

But it was fatal to the King to fight for his money. And though he avoided to fight with enemies abroad, yet he was still enforced to fight for it with rebels at home. For no sooner began the subsidy to be levied[6]

[1] *Limitatum certe; sed tamen amplissimum; ad summam videlicet*, &c.
[2] Spelt *ure* in MS.
[3] So Ed. 1622. The MS. has "the."
[4] *Per Angliam sparsorum.*
[5] *Propter monopolium quoddam, et exactiones novas mercibus impositas.*
[6] The grant was passed on the 13th of February, 1496–7.

in Cornwall, but the people there grew[1] to grudge and murmur; the Cornish being a race of men stout of stomach, mighty of body and limb, and that lived hardly in a barren country, and many of them could for a need live under-ground, that were tinners. They muttered extremely, that it was a thing not to be suffered that for a little stir of the Scots, soon blown over, they should be thus grinded to powder with payments; and said it was for them to pay that had too much, and lived idly; but they would eat their bread that they got with the sweat of their brows, and no man should take it from them. And as in the tides of people once up there want not commonly stirring winds to make them more rough; so this people did light upon two ringleaders or captains of the rout.[2] The one was Michael Joseph, a blacksmith or farrier of Bodmin, a notable talking fellow, and no less desirous to be talked of. The other was Thomas Flammock, a lawyer, that[3] by telling his neighbours commonly upon any occasion that the law was on their side, had gotten great sway amongst them. This man talked learnedly, and as if he could tell how to make a rebellion and never break the peace. He told the people[4] that subsidies were not to be granted nor levied in this case; that is for wars of Scotland: for that the law had provided another course by service of escuage,[5] for those journeys; much less when all was quiet, and war was made but a pretence to poll and pill the people. And therefore that it was good

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "began."
[2] *Rebellionis faces.*
[3] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "who."
[4] *Populum autem magno cum supercilio edocuit.*
[5] *Obligatio tenentis qua astringebatur ad bella cum Scotis.* (Ind. Vocab.)

they should not stand[1] like sheep before the shearers, but put on harness and take weapons in their hands; yet to do no creature hurt, but go and deliver the King a strong petition[2] for the laying down of those grievous payments, and for the punishment of those that had given him that counsel, to make others beware how they did the like in time to come. And said for his part he did not see how they could do the duty of true Englishmen and good liege-men, except they did deliver the King from such wicked ones that would destroy both him and the country. Their aim was at Archbishop Morton and Sir Reignold Bray, who were the King's screens in this envy.

After that these two, Flammock and the blacksmith, had by joint and several pratings[3] found tokens of consent in the multitude, they offered themselves to lead them, until they should hear of better men to be their leaders, which they said would be ere long: telling them further, that they would be but their servants, and first in every danger; but doubted not but to make both the west-end and the east-end of England to meet in so good a quarrel; and that all (rightly understood) was but for the King's service.

The people upon these seditious instigations did arm, most of them with bows and arrows, and bills, and such other weapons of rude and country people; and forthwith under the command of their leaders (which in such cases is ever at pleasure)[4] marched out of

[1] Ed. 1622 "stand now."

[2] *Petitionem validâ manu porrigerent.*

[3] *i. e.* by talking to the people sometimes in companies, and sometimes singly. The translation expresses it more at large — *garrulitate sua, partim publice partim secreto, aures populi implessent et animos vulgi inclinatos et promptos ad consilia sua invenissent.*

[4] *Ad placitum populi.*

Cornwall[1] through Devonshire unto Taunton in Somersetshire, without any slaughter, violence, or spoil of the country. At Taunton[2] they killed in fury an officious and eager commissioner for the subsidy, whom they called the Provost of Perin. Thence they marched to Wells, where the Lord Audley (with whom their leaders had before some secret intelligence), a nobleman of an ancient family, but unquiet and popular and aspiring to ruin, came in to them, and was by them with great gladness and cries of joy accepted as their general; they being now proud that they were led by a nobleman. The Lord Audley led them on from Wells to Salisbury, and from Salisbury to Winchester. Thence the foolish people (who in effect led their leaders) had a mind to be led into Kent; fancying that the people there would join with them; contrary to all reason or judgment; considering the Kentish men had shewed great loyalty and affection to the King so lately before. But the rude people[3] had heard Flammock say that Kent was never conquered, and that they were the freest people[4] of England. And upon these vain noises, they looked for great matters at their hands, in a cause which they conceited to be for the liberty of the subject. But when they were comen into Kent, the country was so well settled, both by the King's late kind usage towards them, and by the credit and power of the Earl of Kent, the Lord Abergavenny, and the Lord Cobham,

[1] In the latter end of May, according to the old Chronicle.

[2] So Stowe; and after him Speed. The old Chronicle however dates this fact later: *i. e.* in the latter end of September when Perkin was in sanctuary, and says it was done by "one James, a robber, who had gathered 6 or 700 rebels to assist Perkin." (Vitel. A. xvi. fo. 167.)

[3] *Fatuus iste populus.*

[4] *Homines inter Anglos in libertate asserenda acerrimos.*

as neither gentleman nor yeoman came in to their aid; which did much damp and dismay many of the simpler sort; insomuch as divers of them did secretly fly from the army and went home; but the sturdier sort, and those that were most engaged, stood by it, and rather waxed proud than failed in hopes and courage. For as it did somewhat appall them, that the people came not in to them; so it did no less encourage them, that the King's forces had not set upon them, having marched from the west unto the east of England. Wherefore they kept on their way, and encamped upon Blackheath,[1] between Greenwich and Eltham; threatening either to bid battle to the King (for now the seas went higher than to Morton and Bray), or to take London within his view; imagining with themselves there to find no less fear than wealth.

But to return to the King. When first he heard of this commotion of the Cornishmen occasioned by the subsidy, he was much troubled therewith; not for itself, but in regard of the concurrence of other dangers that did hang over him at that time. For he doubted lest a war from Scotland, a rebellion from Cornwall, and the practices and conspiracies of Perkin and his partakers, would come upon him at once: knowing well that it was a dangerous triplicity to a monarchy, to have the arms of a foreigner, the discontents of subjects, and the title of a pretender to meet. Nevertheless the occasion took him in some part well provided. For as soon as the Parliament had broken up, the King had presently raised a puissant army to war upon Scotland. And King James of Scotland likewise on his part had made great preparations, either for de-

[1] On Friday, June 16th (old Chron. fo. 163. *b.*)

fence or for a new assailing[1] of England. But as for the King's forces, they were not only in preparation, but in readiness presently to set forth, under the conduct of Dawbeney the Lord Chamberlain. But as soon as the King understood of the rebellion of Cornwall, he stayed those forces, retaining them for his own service and safety. But therewithal he dispatched the Earl of Surrey into the north, for the defence and strength of those parts, in case the Scots should stir. But for the course he held towards the rebels, it was utterly differing from his former custom and practice; which was ever full of forwardness and celerity to make head against them, or to set upon them as soon as ever they were in action. This he was wont to do; but now, besides that he was attempered by years, and less in love with dangers by the continued fruition of a crown, it was a time when the various appearance to his thoughts of perils of several natures and from divers parts did make him judge it his best and surest way to keep his strength together in the seat and centre of his kingdom; according to the ancient Indian emblem — in such a swelling season, to hold the hand upon the middle of the bladder, that no side might rise. Besides, there was no necessity put upon him to alter this counsel. For neither did the rebels spoil the country, in which case it had been dishonour to abandon his people, neither on the other side did their forces gather or increase, which might hasten him to precipitate, and assail them before they grew too strong. And lastly, both reason of estate and war seemed to agree with this course. For that insurrections of base people are commonly more furi-

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 omits "a."

ous in their beginnings. And by this means also he had them the more at vantage, being tired and harassed with a long march;[1] and more at mercy, being cut off far from their country, and therefore not able by any sudden flight to get to retreat, and to renew the troubles.

When therefore the rebels were encamped in[2] Blackheath upon the hill, whence they might behold the city of London, and the fair valley about it; the King, knowing well that it stood him upon,[3] by how much the more he had hitherto protracted the time in not encountering them, by so much the sooner to dispatch with them;[4] that it might appear to have been no coldness in fore-slowing but wisdom in choosing his time; resolved with all speed to assail them; and yet with that providence and surety as should leave little to venture or fortune. And having very great and puissant forces about him, the better to master all events and accidents, he[5] divided them into three parts. The first was led by the Earl of Oxford in chief, assisted by the Earls of Essex and Suffolk. These noblemen were appointed, with some cornets[6] of horse and bands of foot, and good store of artillery, wheeling about to put themselves beyond the hill where the rebels were encamped, and to beset all the

[1] These words are omitted in the translation: which only has *eos plus in arcto habebat et magis sibi obnoxios, cum longe a patria sua remoti essent; ideoque fieri non poterat ut domum se reciperent et motus fortasse renovarent.*

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "on."

[3] *Plurimum honoris sui interesse.* So Hamlet;

"Doth it not, think'st thou, *stand me now upon?*"

The expression was in use as late as Locke's time.

[4] *Prœlium consereret.*

[5] So Ed. 1622. The MS. omits "he."

[6] *Turmis aliquot equitum.*

skirts and descents thereof, except those that lay towards London; thereby to have these wild beasts as it were in a toil. The second part of his forces (which were those that were to be most in action, and upon which he relied most for the fortune of the day) he did assign to be led by the Lord Chamberlain, who was appointed to set upon the rebels in front, from that side which is towards London. The third part of his forces (being likewise great and brave forces) he retained about himself, to be ready upon all events; to restore the fight or consummate the victory; and meanwhile to secure the city. And for that purpose he encamped in person in Saint George's Fields, putting himself between the city and the rebels.

But the City of London, especially at the first upon the near encamping of the rebels, was in great tumult; as it useth to be with wealthy and populous cities, especially those which being for greatness and fortune queens of their regions, do seldom see out of their windows or from their towers an army of enemies.[1] But that which troubled them most was the conceit that they dealt with a rout of people, with whom there was no composition or condition, or orderly treating, if need were; but likely to be bent altogether upon rapine and spoil. And although they had heard that the rebels had behaved themselves quietly and modestly by the way as they went; yet they doubted much that would not last, but rather make them more hungry, and more in appetite to fall upon spoil in the end. Wherefore there was great running to and fro of peo-

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "as it useth to be with wealthy and populous cities (especially those which for greatness and fortune are Queens of their regions) who seldom see," &c.

ple, some to the gates, some to the walls, some to the water-side; giving themselves alarms and panic fears continually. Nevertheless both Tate the Lord Mayor and Shaw and Haddon the Sheriffs did their parts stoutly and well, in arming and ordering the people; and the King likewise did adjoin some captains of experience in the wars to advise and assist the citizens. But soon after when they understood that the King had so ordered the matter, that the rebels must win three battles before they could approach the city, and that he had put his own person between the rebels and them, and that the great care was rather how to impound the rebels that none of them might escape, than that any doubt was made to vanquish them; they grew to be quiet and out of fear; the rather for the confidence they reposed (which was not small) in the three leaders, Oxford, Essex, and Dawbeney; all men well famed and loved amongst the people. As for Jasper Duke of Bedford, whom the King used to employ with the first in his wars, he was then sick, and died soon after.

It was the two and twentieth of June,[1] and a Saturday (which was the day of the week the King fancied[2]), when the battle was fought; though the King had by all the art he could devise given out a false day, as if he prepared to give the rebels battle on the Monday following, the better to find them unprovided and in disarray. The lords that were appointed to circle the hill, had some days before planted them-

[1] This is the date given by Stowe. The old Chronicle however (fo. 64.), calls it the 17th; which is no doubt right. The 22nd of June, 1497, fell on a Thursday.

[2] *Pro fausto ducebat.*

arms reversed, the coat torn; and at Tower-Hill beheaded.[1] Flammock and the blacksmith were hanged drawn and quartered at Tyburn:[2] the blacksmith taking pleasure upon the hurdle (as it seemeth by words that he uttered) to think that he should be famous in after-times. The King was once in mind to have sent down Flammock and the blacksmith to have been executed in Cornwall, for the more terror. But being advertised that the country was yet unquiet and boiling, he thought better not to irritate the people further. All the rest were pardoned by proclamation, and to take out their pardons under seal as many as would. So that more than the blood drawn in the field, the King did satisfy himself with the lives of only three offenders for the expiation of this great rebellion.

It was a strange thing to observe the variety and inequality of the King's executions and pardons: and a man would think it at the first a kind of lottery or chance. But looking into it more nearly, one shall find there was reason for it; much more perhaps, than after so long a distance of time we can now discern. In the Kentish commotion (which was but an handful of men) there were executed to the number of one hundred and fifty; and[3] in this so mighty a rebellion but three. Whether it were that the King put to account the men that were slain in the field; or that he was not willing to be severe in a popular cause; or that the harmless behaviour of this people, that came from the west of England to the east without mischief (almost) or spoil of the country, did somewhat mollify

[1] On Wednesday the 28th of June (old Chron.). Ed. 1622 has "and he at Tower Hill beheaded."

[2] On Tuesday the 27th of June (old Chron.).

[3] So Ed. 1622. The MS. has "but."

him and move him to compassion; or lastly, that he made a great difference between people that did rebel upon wantonness, and them that did rebel upon want.

After the Cornishmen were defeated, there came from Calais to the King an honourable ambassage from the French King; which had arrived at Calais a month before, and was there stayed in respect of the troubles; but honourably entertained and defrayed. The King at their first coming sent unto them, and prayed them to have patience, till a little smoke that was raised in his country, were over; which would soon be: slighting (as his manner was) that openly, which nevertheless he intended seriously. This ambassage concerned no great affair, but only the prolongation of days for payment of money, and some other particulars of the frontiers: and it was indeed but a wooing ambassage, with good respects to entertain the King in good affection. But nothing was done or handled to the derogation of the King's late treaty with the Italians.

But during the time that the Cornishmen were in their march towards London, the King of Scotland, well advertised of all that passed and knowing himself sure of a war from England whensoever those stirs were appeased, neglected not his opportunity; but thinking the King had his hands full, entered the frontiers of England again with an army, and besieged the castle of Norham in person with part of his forces, sending the rest to forage the country. But Foxe Bishop of Duresme, a wise man, and one that could see through the present to the future, doubting as much before, had caused his castle of Norham to be strongly fortified, and furnished with all kind of munition; and had manned it likewise with a very great

number of tall soldiers[1] more than for the proportion of the castle, reckoning rather upon a sharp assault than a long siege. And for the country likewise, he had caused the people to withdraw their cattle and goods into fast places, that were not of easy approach; and sent in post to the Earl of Surrey (who was not far off in Yorkshire) to come in diligence to the succour. So as the Scottish King both failed of doing good upon the castle, and his men had but a catching harvest of their spoils.[2] And when he understood that the Earl of Surrey was coming on with great forces, he returned back into Scotland. The Earl finding the castle freed, and the enemy retired, pursued with all celerity into Scotland; hoping to have overtaken the Scottish King, and to have given him battle. But not attaining him in time, sat down before the castle of Aton, one of the strongest places (then esteemed) between Berwick and Edinburgh; which in a small time he took. And soon after the Scottish King retiring further into his country, and the weather being extraordinary foul and stormy; the Earl returned into England. So that the expeditions on both parts were (in effect) but a castle taken and a castle distressed; not answerable to the puissance of the forces, nor to the heat of the quarrel, nor to the greatness of the expectation.

[1] *Militum fortissimorum.*

[2] *Et militibus prædam satis jejunam compararet.*

According to Stowe the army under Surrey was sent in July. The "*an. reg.* 13" in the margin is probably misplaced. It must have been in 1497, — the 11th month of Henry's 12th year. Fabyan gives the year, but I think not the month.

Buchanan (xiii. 16.) represents the invasion as having taken place immediately upon news arriving in Scotland of the Cornish rebellion: which *would be* about the end of May.

Amongst these troubles both civil and external, came into England from Spain, Peter Hialas, some call him Elias (surely he was the forerunner of the good hap that we enjoy at this day: for his ambassage set[1] the truce between England and Scotland; the truce drew on the peace; the peace the marriage; and the marriage the union of the kingdoms); a man of great wisdom,[2] and (as those times were) not unlearned; sent from Ferdinando and Isabella, Kings of Spain, unto the King, to treat a marriage between Katherine, their second daughter, and Prince Arthur. This treaty was by him set in a very good way;[3] and almost brought to perfection. But it so fell out by the way, that upon some conference which he had with the King touching this business, the King (who had a great dexterity in getting suddenly into the bosom of ambassadors of foreign Princes, if he liked the men; insomuch as he would many times communicate with them of his own affairs, yea and employ them in his service,) fell into speech and discourse incidently, concerning the ending of the debates and differences with Scotland. For the King naturally did not love the barren wars with Scotland; though he made his profit of the noise of them: and he wanted not in the counsel of Scotland those that would advise their King to meet him at the half way, and to give over the war with England; pretending to be good patriots, but indeed favouring the affairs of the King. Only his heart was too great to begin with Scotland for the motion of

[1] *Induxit.*

[2] *Prudens.* Wherever "wise" occurs in the English, it is translated *prudens* in the Latin.

[3] *Dexteritate legati non segniter promotus.*

peace. On the other side, he had met with an ally of Ferdinando of Arragon, as fit for his turn as could be. For after that King Ferdinando had upon assured confidence of the marriage to succeed taken upon him the person of a fraternal ally to the King, he would not let,[1] in a Spanish gravity, to counsel the King in his own affairs. And the King on his part not being wanting to himself, but making use of every man's humours, made his advantage of this in such things as he thought either not decent or not pleasant to proceed from himself; putting them off as done by the counsel of Ferdinando: wherefore he was content that Hialas (as in a matter moved and advised from Hialas himself) should go into Scotland, to treat of a concord between the two Kings. Hialas took it upon him, and coming to the Scottish King, after he had with much art brought King James to hearken to the more safe and quiet counsels, writ unto the King that he hoped that peace would with no great difficulty cement and close, if he would send some wise and temperate counsellor of his own, that might treat of the conditions. Whereupon the King directed Bishop Foxe (who at that time was at his castle of Norham) to confer with Hialas, and they both to treat with some commissioners deputed from the Scottish King. The commissioners on both sides met.[2] But after much dispute upon the articles and conditions of peace propounded upon either part, they could not conclude a peace. The chief impediment thereof was the demand of the

[1] *Non dubitabat.*

[2] Jedburgh, according to Buchanan, xiii. 17.; from whom most of rticulars appear to have been taken. But one of the commenta- king on the authority of documents, says they met at Aton.

King to have Perkin delivered into his hands; as a reproach to all Kings, and a person not protected by the law of nations. The King of Scotland on the other side peremptorily denied so to do; saying that he for his part was no competent judge of Perkin's title: but that he had received him as a suppliant, protected him as a person fled for refuge, espoused him with his kinswoman, and aided him with his arms, upon the belief that he was a Prince; and therefore that he could not now with his honour so unrip and in a sort put a lie upon all that he had said and done before, as to deliver him up to his enemies. The Bishop likewise (who had certain proud instructions from the King,[1] at the least in the front, though there were a pliant clause at the foot, that remitted all to the Bishop's discretion, and required him[2] by no means to break off in ill terms,) after that he had failed to obtain the delivery of Perkin, did move a second point of his instructions; which was, that the Scottish King would give the King an interview in person at Newcastle. But this being reported to the Scottish King, his answer was, that he meant to treat a peace, and not to go a begging for it. The Bishop

[1] A copy of instructions answering this description, and dated at Shene, 5 July, 1497, may be seen in the Cotton MSS. Vesp. C. xvi. fo. 141. Reference is made in them to a previous treaty lately made at "Jenynhaugh" (date not mentioned) in which it seems that certain offers were made by the Earl of Angus and Lord Home, which could not be accepted, — apparently because they did not include the delivery of Perkin into Henry's hands. It is possible that Fox had similar instructions for his guidance in that previous negotiation, and that it was that which ended in the "recess" which Bacon speaks of; during which James took occasion to send Perkin away. For it was on the 6th of July, according to Tytler (iv. p. 385.), that he sailed: therefore before the instructions of the 5th could have been received.

[2] *Etiam disertis verbis præcipiens.*

also according to another article of his instructions, demanded restitution of the spoils taken by the Scottish, or damages for the same. But the Scottish commissioners answered, that that was but as water spilt upon the ground, which could not be gotten up again; and that the King's people were better able to bear the loss than their master to repair it. But in the end as persons capable of reason[1] on both sides, they made rather a kind of recess than a breach of treaty, and concluded upon a truce for some months following.[2] But the King of Scotland, though he would not formally retract his judgment of Perkin, wherein he had engaged himself so far; yet in his private opinion, upon often speech with the Englishmen and divers other advertisements, began to suspect him for a counterfeit; wherefore in a noble fashion he called him unto him, and recounted the benefits and favours that he had done him in making him his ally, and in provoking a mighty and opulent King by an offensive war in his quarrel, for the space of two years together; nay more, that he had refused an honourable peace, whereof he had a fair offer if he would have delivered him; and that to keep his prom-

[1] *Moderati et rationi non recalcitrantes.*

[2] So Buchanan, xiii. 17. But the truce "for some months" was probably the result of the previous negotiation at Jenynhaugh. By the time Fox received the instructions of the 5th of July, Perkin was gone and the obstacle removed. The commissioners met, D'Ayala acting as a kind of mediator, and agreed in the first instance upon a truce for seven years. This was concluded on the 30th of September, 1497. Soon after a new negotiation was commenced, D'Ayala acting on the part of James, and Warham on the part of Henry; which ended in an extension of the term to the lives of the two kings and a year after the death of the survivor. It was signed by Warham in London on the 5th of December; proclaimed in London the next day (see old Chronicle); and ratified by James on the 10th of February, 1497-8.

ise with him, he had deeply offended both his nobles and people, whom he might not hold in any long discontent: and therefore required him to think of his own fortunes, and to choose out some fitter place for his exile: telling him withal that he could not say but the English had forsaken him before the Scottish; for that upon two several trials, none had declared themselves on his side: but nevertheless he would make good what he said to him at his first receiving, which was that he should not repent him for putting himself into his hands; for that he would not cast him off, but help him with shipping and means to transport him where he should desire.

Perkin, not descending at all from his stage-like greatness, answered the King in few words; That he saw his time was not yet come; but whatsoever his fortunes were, he should both think and speak honour of the King. Taking his leave, he would not think on Flanders, doubting it was but hollow ground for him since the treaty of the Archduke concluded the year before; but took his lady, and such followers as would not leave him, and sailed over into Ireland.

This twelfth year of the King a little before this time,[1] Pope Alexander, who loved best those Princes that were furthest off and with whom he had least to do; and taking very thankfully the King's late entrance into league for the defence of Italy; did remunerate him with an hallowed sword and cap of maintenance, sent by his Nuncio. Pope Innocent had

[1] These words are omitted in the translation. If it was at Allhallowmass (1 Nov.) in the 12th year of the King, it was a good deal before the time Bacon is speaking of. Henry's 12th year began on the 22nd of August, 1496. We are now in July, 1497.

done the like, but it was not received in that glory.[1] For the King appointed the Mayor and his brethren to meet the Pope's orator at London-bridge, and all the streets between the bridge-foot and the palace of Paul's (where the King then lay) were garnished with the citizens,[2] standing in their liveries. And the morrow after being Allhallown-day,[3] the King, attended with many of his prelates and[4] nobles and principal courtiers, went in procession to Paul's, and the cap and sword were borne before him; and after the procession, the King himself remaining seated in the quire, the Lord Archbishop upon the greese[5] of the quire made a long oration; setting forth the greatness and eminency of that honour which the Pope (in these ornaments and ensigns of benediction) had done the King; and how rarely and upon what high deserts they used to be bestowed: and then recited the King's principal acts and merits, which had made him appear worthy in the eyes of his Holiness of this great honour.

All this while the rebellion of Cornwall (whereof

[1] There was probably no account of the reception of the cap of maintenance sent by Pope Innocent in any of the histories to which Bacon had access. But there is a full account of it in the Herald's journal (Cott. Jul. B. xi.; printed by Leland, vol. iv. p. 244.) and the arrangements were much the same as those which Bacon proceeds to describe. So much so, that if the old Chronicle from which his account is taken (Vitel. A. xvi. f. 161.) had been lost and the Herald's journal preserved, one might have suspected him of having mistaken the date. The former occasion was in 1488.

[2] The translation makes it part of the King's directions that the streets should be thus garnished. *Etenim rex nunc mandavit majori &c. ut oratori Papæ ad pedem pontis Londinensis obviam fierent, atque plateæ universæ inter pontem et palatium episcopi Londinensis (ubi rex tunc hospitabatur) civium fraternitatibus, in sagulis suis vestitis, utrinque clauderentur.*

[3] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "All-hallowes."

[4] Ed. 1622 omits "and."

[5] *Super gradus ante chorum stans.* Ed. 1622 has "greece."

we have spoken) seemed to have no relation to Perkin; save that perhaps Perkin's proclamation had stricken upon the right vein, in promising to lay down exactions and payments; and so had made them now and then have a kind thought on Perkin. But now these bubbles by much stirring began to meet, as they use to do upon the top of water. The King's lenity (by that time the Cornish rebels, who were taken and pardoned, and as it was said many of them sold by them that had taken them for twelve pence and two shillings apiece, were come down into their country) had rather emboldened them than reclaimed them;[1] insomuch as they stuck[2] not to say to their neighbours and countrymen that the King did well to pardon them; for that he knew he should leave few subjects in England, if he hanged all that were of their mind: and began whetting and inciting one another to renew the commotion. Some of the subtlest of them, hearing of Perkin's being in Ireland, found means to send to him to let him know that if he would come over to them they would serve him. When Perkin heard this news, he began to take heart again, and advised upon it with his counsel; which were principally three;[3] Herne a mercer that had fled for debt; Skelton a taylor, and Astley a scrivener; (for secretary Frion was gone.) These told him that he was mightily overseen both when he went into Kent and when he went into Scotland; the one being a place so near

[1] This rather awkward sentence is more clearly expressed in the Latin. *Regis clementia rebelles Cornubienses (postquam domum rediissent, sine pœna dimissi, verum ut diximus solidi unius aut duorum pretio redempti) magis animaverat quam sanaverat.*

[2] The MS has "stick."

[3] *Ex quibus tres plurimum apud eum poterant.*

London, and under the King's nose; and the other a nation so distasted with the people of England, that if they had loved him never so well, yet they would never have taken his part in that company. But if he had been so happy as to have been in Cornwall at the first, when the people began to take arms there, he had been crowned at Westminster before this time: for these Kings (as he had now experience) would sell poor princes for shoes: but he must rely wholly upon people; and therefore advised him to sail over with all possible speed into Cornwall: which accordingly he did; having in his company four small barks, with some sixscore or sevenscore fighting-men. He arrived in September at Whitsand-Bay, and forthwith came to Bodmin, the blacksmith's town;[1] where there assembled unto him to the number of three thousand men of the rude people.

There he set forth a new proclamation, stroking the people with fair promises, and humouring them with invectives against the King and his government. And as it fareth with smoke that never leeseth itself till it be at the highest, he did now before his end raise his stile, intitling himself no more Richard Duke of York, but Richard the Fourth, King of England.[2] His coun-

[1] Michael Joseph. *Oppidum fabri ferrarii de quo ante diximus.*

[2] These words from "he did now," are omitted in the translation; where it is only said *magnifice admodum de seipso loquebatur;* Bacon having remembered, no doubt, or been reminded, that Perkin's Scotch proclamation ran in the name of "Richard, by the grace of God, King of England and of France, Lord of Ireland, Prince of Wales." He had been misled by Speed, who speaks of that proclamation (p. 741.) as "made in the name of *Richard Duke of York;*" and says afterwards that Perkin after his landing in Cornwall, found means to raise thousands of people "whom with most lavish promises, invective proclamations, and strong impudency, he held together *under the title of Richard the Fourth King of England.*"

sel advised him by all means to make himself master of some good walled town; as well to make his men find the sweetness of rich spoils, and to allure to him all loose and lost people by like hopes of booty; as to be a sure retreat to his forces, in case they should have any ill day or unlucky chance in the field. Wherefore they took heart to them, and went on and besieged the city of Exeter,[1] the principal town for strength and wealth in those parts. When they were comen before Exeter, they forebore to use any force at the first, but made continual shouts and outcries to terrify the inhabitants, and[2] did likewise in divers places call and talk to them from under the walls, to join with them, and be of their party; telling them that the King[3] would make them another London, if they would be the first town that should acknowledge him: but they had not the wit to send to them, in any orderly fashion, agents or chosen men to tempt them and to treat with them. The citizens on their part shewed themselves stout and loyal subjects; neither was there so much as any tumult or division amongst them, but all prepared themselves for a valiant defence, and making good the town. For well they saw that the rebels were of no such number or power that they needed to fear them as yet: and well they hoped that before their numbers increased the King's succours would come in. And howsoever, they thought it the extremest of evils to put themselves at the mercy of those hungry and disorderly

[1] On Sunday, September 17. About 1 p. m. See Ellis's Letters, 1st ser. vol. i. p. 34.

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has a full stop after "inhabitants," and begins the next sentence with "They."

[3] *Regem Richardum.*

people. Wherefore setting all things in good order within the town, they nevertheless let down with cords from several parts of the walls privily, several messengers (that if one came to mischance another might pass on), which should advertise the King of the state of the town, and implore his aid. Perkin also doubted that succours would come ere long, and therefore resolved to use his utmost force to assault the town. And for that purpose having mounted scaling-ladders in divers places upon the walls, made at the same instant an attempt to force one of the gates. But having no artillery nor engines, and finding that he could do no good by ramming with logs of timber, nor by the use of iron bars and iron crows and such other means at hand, he[1] had no way left him but to set one of the gates on fire; which he did. But the citizens well perceiving the danger, before the gate could be fully consumed, blocked up the gate and some space about it on the inside with faggots and other fuel, which they likewise set on fire, and so repulsed fire with fire; and in the mean time raised up rampiers of earth, and cast up deep trenches, to serve instead of wall and gate. And for the escaladaes, they had so bad success, as the rebels were driven from the walls with the loss of two hundred men.[2]

The King when he heard of Perkin's siege of Exeter, made sport with it; and said to them that were about him, that the King of rake-hells was landed in the west, and that he hoped now to have the honour to see him, which he could never yet do. And it ap-

[1] So Ed. 1622. MS. omits "he."

[2] Above three or four hundred, according to King Henry. See Ellis's Letters, 1st ser. vol. i. p. 34.

peared plainly to those that were about the King, that he was indeed much joyed with the news of Perkin's being in English ground, where he could have no retreat by land; thinking now, that he should be cured of those privy stitches, which he had had[1] long about his heart, and had sometimes broken his sleeps in the midst of all his felicity. And to set all men's hearts on fire, he did by all possible means let it appear, that those that should now do him service to make an end of these troubles, should be no less accepted of him than he that came upon the eleventh hour and had the whole wages of the day. Therefore now, like the end of a play, a great number came upon the stage at once. He sent the Lord Chamberlain, and the Lord Brooke, and Sir Rice ap Thomas, with expedite forces to speed to Exeter to the rescue of the town, and to spread the fame of his own following in person with a royal army. The Earl of Devonshire and his son, with the Carews, and the Fulfordes and other principal persons of Devonshire (uncalled from the court, but hearing that the King's heart was so much bent upon this service), made haste with troops that they had raised to be the first that should succour the city of Exeter, and prevent the King's succours. The Duke of Buckingham likewise with many brave gentlemen put themselves in arms, not staying either the King's or Lord Chamberlain's[2] coming on, but making a body of forces of themselves, the more to endear their merit; signifying to the King their readiness, and desiring to know his pleasure. So that according to the proverb, In the coming down every Saint did help.

[1] So MS. In Ed. 1622 "had long had."
[2] Ed. 1622 "the Lord Chamberlaines."

Perkin hearing this thunder of arms and preparations against him from so many parts, raised his siege[1] and marched to Taunton, beginning already to squint one eye upon the crown and another upon the sanctuary; though the Cornishmen were become like metal often fired and quenched, churlish,[2] and that would sooner break than bow; swearing and vowing not to leave him till the uttermost drop of their blood were spilt. He was at his rising from Exeter between six and seven thousand strong, many having comen unto him after he was set before Exeter, upon fame of so great an enterprise, and to partake of the spoil; though upon the raising of the[3] siege some did slip away. When he was comen near Taunton, he dissembled all fear; and seemed all the day to use diligence in preparing all things ready to fight. But about midnight he fled with threescore horse to Bewley[4] in the New Forest; where he and divers of his company registered themselves sanctuary-men, leaving his Cornishmen to the four winds; but yet thereby easing them of their vow; and using his wonted compassion, not to be by when his subjects blood should be spilt. The King as soon as he heard of Perkin's flight, sent presently five hundred horse to pursue and apprehend him, before he should get either to the sea or to that same little island called a sanctuary. But they came too late for the latter of these. Therefore all they could do was to beset the sanctuary, and to maintain a strong watch about it, till the King's pleasure were

[1] On the 18th of September. See Ellis's Letters, 1st ser. vol. i. p. 34.
[2] *Obstinati.*
[3] So Ed. 1622. The MS. has "his siege."
[4] On the 21st of September. See Ellis's Letters, 1st ser. vol. i. p. 34.

further known. As for the rest of the rebels, they (being destituted of their head) without stroke stricken submitted themselves unto the King's mercy. And the King who commonly drew blood (as physicians do) rather to save life than to spill it, and was never cruel when he was secure, now he saw the danger was past, pardoned them all in the end; except some few desperate persons, which he reserved to be executed, the better to set off his mercy towards the rest. There were also sent with all speed some horse to Saint Michael's Mount in Cornwall, where the Lady Katherine Gordon was left by her husband, whom in all fortunes she entirely loved; adding the virtues of a wife to the virtues of her sex. The King sent in the greater diligence, not knowing whether she might be with child, whereby the business would not have ended in Perkin's person. When she was brought to the King, it was commonly said that the King received her not only with compassion but with affection; pity giving more impression to her excellent beauty. Wherefore comforting her, to serve as well his eye as his fame, he sent her to his Queen, to remain with her; giving her very honourable allowance for the support of her estate, which she enjoyed both during the King's life and many years after. The name of the White Rose, which had been given to her husband's false title, was continued in common speech to her true beauty.

The King went forwards on his journey, and made a joyful entrance into Exeter,[1] where he gave the citi-

[1] It appears by an entry in the Privy Purse expences that Perkin was brought to Taunton on the 5th of October, where the King was, on his way to Exeter. He reached Exeter on the 7th.

zens great commendations and thanks; and taking the sword he wore from his side, he gave it to the Mayor, and commanded it should be ever after carried before him. There also he caused to be executed some of the ringleaders of the Cornishmen, in sacrifice to the citizens; whom they had put in fear and trouble. At Exeter the King consulted with his counsel, whether he should offer life to Perkin if he would quit the sanctuary and voluntarily submit himself. The counsel were divided in opinion. Some advised the King to take him out of sanctuary perforce, and to put him to death, as in a case of necessity, which in itself dispenseth with consecrated places and things; wherein they doubted not also but the King should find the Pope tractable to ratify his deed, either by declaration or at least by indulgence. Others were of opinion, since all was now safe and no further hurt could be done, that it was not worth the exposing of the King to new scandal and envy. A third sort fell upon the opinion[1] that it was not possible for the King ever either to satisfy the world well touching the imposture or to learn out the bottom of the conspiracy, except by promise of life and pardon and other fair means he should get Perkin into his hands. But they did all in their preambles much bemoan the King's case, with a kind of indignation at his fortune; that a Prince of his high wisdom and virtue should have been so long and so oft exercised and vexed with idols. But the King said that it was the vexation of God Almighty himself to be vexed with idols, and therefore that that was not to trouble any of his friends: and that for himself he al-

[1] In the translation he says they distinctly advised him: *regem diserte præmonebat.*

ways despised them, but was grieved that they had put his people to such trouble and misery. But in conclusion he leaned to the third opinion; and so sent some to deal with Perkin; who seeing himself a prisoner and destitute of all hopes, having tried princes and people, great and small, and found all either false, faint, or unfortunate, did gladly accept of the condition. The King did also while he was at Exeter appoint the Lord Darcy and others commissioners for the fining of all such as were of any value,[1] and had any hand or partaking in the aid or comfort of Perkin or the Cornishmen, either in the field or in the flight. These commissioners proceeded with such strictness and severity, as did much obscure the King's mercy in sparing of blood, with the bleeding of so much treasure. Perkin was brought unto the King's court, but not to the King's presence; though the King to satisfy his curiosity saw him sometimes out of a window[2] or in passage. He was in shew at liberty, but guarded with all care and watch that was possible, and willed to follow the King to London. But from his first appearance upon the stage in his new person of a sycophant or juggler, instead of his former person of a Prince, all men may think how he was exposed to the derision not only of the courtiers but also of the common people, who flocked about him as he went along, that one might know afar off where the owl was, by the flight of birds; some mocking, some wondering, some cursing, some prying and picking matter out of his countenance and gesture to talk of. So that the

[1] The original return of the fines levied is preserved in the British Museum. See Ellis's Letters, 1st ser. vol. i. p. 38.

[2] This is omitted in the translation.

false honour and respects which he had so long enjoyed was plentifully repaid in scorn and contempt. As soon as he was comen to London, the King gave also the City the solace of this may-game. For he was conveyed leisurely on horseback, but not in any ignominious fashion, through Cheapside and Cornhill[1] to the Tower, and from thence back again unto Westminster, with the churmne[2] of a thousand taunts and reproaches. But to amend the show, there followed a little distance off Perkin, an inward counsellor of his, one that had been serjeant farrier to the King. This fellow, when Perkin took sanctuary, chose rather to take an holy habit than a holy place, and clad himself like an hermit, and in that weed wandered about the country, till he was discovered and taken. But this man was bound hand and foot upon the horse, and came not back with Perkin, but was left at the Tower,[3] and within few days after executed. Soon after, now that Perkin could tell better what himself was, he was diligently examined; and after his confession taken, an extract was made of such parts of them[4] as were thought fit to be divulged; which was printed and dispersed abroad: wherein the King did himself no right: for as there was a laboured tale of particulars of Perkin's father and mother and grandsire and grandmother and uncles and cousins, by names and surnames, and from what places he travelled up and

[1] The MS. as well as the edition of 1622 has *Cornewall;* which is evidently wrong. The Latin translation has *Cornhill.* This, according to Stowe, was on the 20th of November, 1497; the 13th of the King.

[2] *Churm* is an old Saxon word, meaning a confused murmuring noise. In the translation *cum choro* is substituted.

[3] These words are omitted in the translation.

[4] So both MS. and Ed. 1622.

down; so there was little or nothing to purpose of any thing concerning his designs, or any practices that had been held with him; nor the Duchess of Burgundy herself, that all the world did take knowledge of as the person that had put life and being into the whole business, so much as named or pointed at;[1] so that men missing of that they looked for, looked about for they knew not what, and were in more doubt than before. But the King chose rather not to satisfy than to kindle coals.[2] At that time also it did not appear by any new examinations or commitments that any other person of quality was discovered or appeached, though the King's closeness made that a doubt dormant.

About this time[3] a great fire in the night-time suddenly began at the King's palace of Shyne, near unto the King's own lodgings; whereby a great part of the building was consumed, with much costly household-stuff; which gave the King occasion of building from the ground that fine pile of Richmond, which is now standing.

Somewhat before this time also, there fell out a memorable accident. There was one Sebastian Gabato, a Venetian, dwelling in Bristow, a man seen and expert in cosmography and navigation. This man seeing the success and emulating perhaps the enterprise of Christopherus Columbus in that fortunate discovery towards the south-west, which had been by him made some six years before,[4] conceited with him-

[1] The translation adds *sed prorsus silentio prætermissa.*

[2] *Verum regi magis placebat vulgo non satisfacere quam grandium animos irritare.*

[3] On St. Thomas's Day, at night, about nine o'clock. (Old Chron. fo. 171. *b.*).

[4] Columbus saw the light on San Salvador on the 3rd of October, 1492

self that lands might likewise be discovered towards the north-west. And surely it may be he had more firm and pregnant conjectures of it than Columbus had of his at the first. For the two great islands of the old and new world, being in the shape and making of them broad towards the north and pointed towards the south, it is likely that the discovery first began where the lands did nearest meet. And there had been before that time a discovery[1] of some lands, which they took to be islands, and were indeed the continent of America, towards the north-west. And it may be, that some relation of this nature coming afterwards to the knowledge of Columbus, and by him suppressed (desirous rather to make his enterprise the child of his science and fortune than the follower of a former discovery), did give him better assurance that all was not sea from the west of Europe and Africke unto Asia, than either Seneca's prophecy, or Plato's antiquities, or the nature of the tides and land-winds and the like, which were the conjectures that were given out whereupon he should have relied: though I am not ignorant that it was likewise laid unto the casual and wind-beaten discovery a little before of a Spanish pilot who died in the house of Columbus. But this Gabato bearing the King in hand[2] that he would find out an island endued with rich commodities, procured him to man and victual a ship at Bristow for the discovery of that island: with whom ventured also three small ships

(see Conquerors of the New World and their Bondsmen, vol. i. p. 100.); — while Henry was arranging the treaty of Estaples.

[1] *Quin et memoria extabat aliquarum terrarum ad zephyro-boream ante discoopertarum et pro insulis habitarum; quæ tamen revera essent pars continentis Americæ borealis.*

[2] *Regi fidem faciens.*

of London merchants,[1] fraught with some gross and slight wares, fit for commerce with barbarous people. He sailed, as he affirmed at his return (and made a card thereof), very far westwards, with a quarter of the north, on the north side of Terra de Labrador, until he came to the latitude of sixty-seven degrees and a half, finding the seas still open.[2] It is certain also

[1] "Which departed (says the old Chronicle, Vitel. A. xvi. p. 178) from the west country in the beginning of summer; *but to this present month came never knowledge of their exploit.*"

This was in Henry's thirteenth year,—1498. Stowe puts it on the fourteenth; probably by an accidental misplacement of the A. R. in the margin. But it is very singular that neither of them takes any notice of Sebastian Cabot's *first* voyage, which took place the year before, and which had resulted in no less an "exploit" than the first discovery of the North American continent. It was on the 24th of June, 1497, at five o'clock in the morning, that they saw land first; at what exact point we do not know; but apparently at some part of the coast of Labrador, with an island not far off. The result of the expedition was known in England in the beginning of August; for in the Privy Purse Expences of Henry VII. we find an entry (p. 113.) of 10*l.* paid on the 10th of August, 1497, "to him that found the new isle." And the second voyage of 1498 appears to have been undertaken with a view rather to settlement than discovery, the commission (3rd Feb. 1497–8) having special reference to "the Londe and Isles of late found." The fate of it (strange to say) is to this day a matter of conjecture; but it is supposed to have been a failure. For an elaborate discussion of all questions connected with this subject, see "A Memoir of Sebastian Cabot; with a review of the History of Maritime Discovery," 2nd ed. Lond. 1832. Compare also an account of a paper in the Miscellanies of the Philobiblon Society, communicated by Mr. Cheney,—in Notes and Queries, 2nd ser. No. 105, 2nd Jan. 1856.

The old Chronicle (it should be added) does not mention Sebastian Cabot's name; but merely calls him "a stranger Venisian which by a caart mad hym self expert in knowing of the world."

[2] This statement comes, through Stowe, from "Sir Humphrey Gilbert's Discovery for a new passage to Cataia;" whose authority appears to have been a letter from Sebastian Cabot to Ramusio. But the date of the voyage in question is not given; and there is reason to believe that it took place in 1511. See "Memoir of Cabot," p. 118. Perhaps the three contradictory statements as to the northernmost point reached by Cabot may be best explained by supposing that in 1497 he sailed to the 56th degree, in 1498 to the 58th, and in 1517 to the 67½th.

that the King's fortune had a tender of that great empire of the West-Indies. Neither was it a refusal on the King's part, but a delay by accident, that put by so great an acquest. For Christopherus Columbus, refused by the King of Portugal (who would not embrace at once both east and west), employed his brother Bartholomeus Columbus unto King Henry to negotiate for his discovery. And it so fortuned that he was taken by pirates at sea; by which accidental impediment he was long ere he came to the King; so long, that before he had obtained a capitulation with the King for his brother the enterprise by him was achieved,[1] and so the West-Indies by providence were then reserved for the crown of Castilia. Yet this sharpened the King so, that not only in this voyage, but again in the sixteenth year of his reign, and likewise in the eighteenth thereof, he granted forth new commissions for the discovery and investing of unknown lands.

In this fourteenth year also,[2] by God's wonderful

[1] The translation says only that it was *undertaken*, meaning that Christopher Columbus had made his arrangements with Ferdinand and Isabella. *Tam diu ut priusquam cum rege Henrico transegisset expeditio illa a fratre suo Christophoro suscepta esset.*

[2] If there be no oversight here, we must conclude that Bacon (following Stowe) supposed Sebastian Gabato's expedition to have taken place in Henry's fourteenth year, that is between 22 August, 1498, and 21 August, 1499: in which case it must have been nearly a year *after* the events he had been speaking of, instead of a little before. We do not indeed know the exact date of the publication of Perkin's confession. But he was shown in London at the end of November, 1497; in Henry's thirteenth year; and his confession is represented as having been made "soon after." The accident at Norham appears to have occurred in November, 1498: for on the 26th of that month the Sheriff of Northumberland was directed to make proclamation summoning several persons, inhabitants of Ryddesdale and Tyndale (northward), to appear within three days at Berwick before Thomas Darcy, Knt., Lieutenant of the East and Middle marches towards

providence, that boweth things unto his will, and hangeth great weights upon small wires, there fell out a trifling and untoward accident, that drew on great and happy effects. During the truce with Scotland, there were certain Scottish young gentlemen that came into Norham town, and there made merry with some

Scotland, *to answer for murder committed on certain Scotchmen*, contrary to the peace between England and Scotland. (See Cal. Pat. Rolls, 14 Hen. VII. pt. 1. p. 39.) The "peace" alluded to was no doubt the truce concluded in December, 1497, and ratified by James on the 10th of February following. (See note 2. p. 280.) The error as to the date of this accident comes from Polydore Vergil; who begins his account of it (immediately after relating the capture of Perkin at Exeter and the proceedings consequent) with *eodem anno.*

The season of quiet which followed the suppression of the insurrection in Cornwall, the capture of Perkin, and the conclusion of this truce, was taken advantage of by Henry, not only for quenching the embers of the rebellion in England by examining, punishing, and pardoning; but also for making an attempt to civilise Ireland. Sir Edward Poynings's Parliament, three years before, had extended the English statutes to Ireland. Henry wished now to try whether English manners and customs could not be introduced likewise. Accordingly on the 28th of March, 1498, he commissioned the Earl of Kildare to summon a Parliament for the purpose of taking into consideration, among other things, measures for prohibiting absenteeism, except for purposes of education; — for causing the English dress to be worn and English weapons used; — for enforcing the cleansing of towns, ditching, draining, paving, &c.; and for levying customs and other dues. It was proposed that the Lords in Parliament should wear robes as in England; that every Lord or other person having livelihood or benefice worth 20 marks a year should "ride in a saddle after the English guise;" and that merchants and others of that degree should wear gowns and cloaks, instead of the usual "hucks and foldings." Provision was also to be made for the election of a Justice (in absence of the Lieutenant) to hold the Government during the interval. The reversal of the attainder of the Earl of Kildare by the English Parliament was to be ratified. And William Barry, commonly called Lord Barry, of Munster, and John Water, of Cork, merchant, having of late received divers letters from "Parkyn Wosebek" and treasonably concealed the same from the King and his Council, were to be attainted of high treason.

Such was to be the principal business of this Parliament, as detailed in the Calendar of Patent Rolls, 13 Hen. VII. p. 33. What was done, and with what success, I do not know. No mention is made of it in the English histories.

of the English of the town; and having little to do, went sometimes forth, and would stand looking upon the castle. Some of the garrison of the castle, observing this their doing twice or thrice, and having not their minds purged of the late ill blood of hostility, either suspected them or quarelled[1] them for spies. Whereupon they fell at ill words, and from words to blows, so that many were wounded of either side; and the Scottishmen, being strangers[2] in the town, had the worst; insomuch that some of them were slain, and the rest made haste home. The matter being complained on, and often debated before the Wardens of Marches of both sides, and no good order taken, the King of Scotland took it to himself,[3] and being much kindled, sent a herald to the King to make protestation that if reparation were not done, according to the conditions of the truce,[4] his King did denounce war. The King, who had often tried fortune and was inclined to peace, made answer that what had been done was utterly against his will and without his privity; but if the garrison soldiers had been in fault, he would see them punished; and the truce in all points to be preserved. But this answer seemed to the Scottish King but a delay, to make the complaint breathe out with time; and therefore it did rather exasperate him than satisfy him. Bishop Foxe, understanding from the King that the Scottish King was still discontent and impatient, being troubled that the occasion of breaking the truce should grow from his men, sent many hum-

[1] *Calumniabantur.*
[2] The translation adds *uti verisimile est.*
[3] *In suam contumeliam factum esse interpretatus est.*
[4] This clause is omitted in the translation.

ble and deprecatory letters to the Scottish King to appease him. Whereupon King James, mollified by the Bishop's submiss and eloquent letters, writ back unto him, that though he were in part moved by his letters, yet he should not be fully satisfied except he spake with him; as well about the compounding of the present differences, as about other matters that might concern the good of both kingdoms. The Bishop, advising first with the King, took his journey for Scotland. The meeting was at Melrosse, an abbey of the Cistercians, where the King then abode. The King first roundly uttered unto the Bishop his offence conceived for the insolent breach of truce by his men of Norham-castle: whereunto Bishop Foxe made such an humble and smooth answer, as it was like oil into the wound, whereby it began to heal. And this was done in the presence of the King and his counsel. After the King spake with the bishop apart, and opened himself unto him, saying that these temporary truces and peaces were soon made and soon broken; but that he desired a straiter amity with the King of England; discovering his mind, that if the King would give him in marriage the Lady Margaret, his eldest daughter, that indeed might be a knot indissoluble: that he knew well what place and authority the Bishop deservedly had with his master: therefore if he would take the business to heart and deal in it effectually, he doubted not but it would succeed well. The Bishop answered soberly, that he thought himself rather happy than worthy to be an instrument in such a matter, but would do his best endeavour. Wherefore the Bishop returning to the King and giving him account of what had passed and finding the

King more than well disposed in it,[1] gave the King advice, first to proceed to a conclusion of peace, and then to go on with the treaty of marriage by degrees. Hereupon a peace was concluded, which was published a little before Christmas,[2] in the fourteenth year of the King's reign, to continue for both the Kings' lives and the over-liver of them and a year after. In this peace there was an article contained, That no Englishman should enter into Scotland, and no Scottishman into England, without letters commendatory from the Kings of either nation. This at the first sight might seem a means to continue a strangeness between the nations; but it was done to lock in the borderers.[3]

This year there was also born to the King a third son, who was christened by the name of Edmond, and shortly after died.[4] And much about the same time came news of the death of Charles the French King:[5] for whom there were celebrated solemn and princely obsequies.

It was not long but Perkin, who was made of quicksilver (which is hard to hold or imprison), began to

[1] *Propensum et fere cupidum.* There was a commission for treating on the subject of this match granted by Henry in the summer of 1496. But I suppose it did not come to actual negotiation at that time, as James was then preparing to invade England with Perkin.

[2] I think this is a mistake. The former treaty (see note 2. p. 280.) was published a little before Christmas, 1497. The treaty now in question, which contains the article concerning the letters commendatory (Rymer xii. 724), was not concluded till the 12th July, 1499. It was ratified by James on the 20th, at Strivelin, and immediately after, that is on the 11th of September, a commission was granted to Bishop Fox to treat of the marriage.

[3] *Ad limitaneos coercendos, qui dissidiorum causa esse consueverant.*

[4] He was christened on the 24th February A° 14 [1498–9] and died on the Friday after Whitsunday, A° 15; which would be the 12th of June, 1500. (Old Chron. fo. 174 *b.* and 181.)

[5] The news arrived in London in April, 1498. (Old Chron. fo. 172.)

stir. For deceiving his keepers,[1] he took him to his heels, and made speed to the sea-coast.[2] But presently all corners were laid for him, and such diligent pursuit and search made, as he was fain to turn back and get him to the house of Bethleem, called the Priory of Shyne (which had the privilege of sanctuary), and put himself into the hands of the Prior of that monastery. The Prior was thought an holy man, and much reverenced in those days. He came to the King and besought the King for Perkin's life only, leaving him otherwise to the King's discretion. Many about the King were again more hot than ever to have the King to take him forth and hang him. But the King that had an high stomach and could not hate any that he despised, bid take him forth and set the knave in the stocks. And so promising the Prior his life, he caused him to be brought forth. And within two or three days after,[3] upon a scaffold set up in the palace-court at Westminster, he was fettered and set in the stocks for the whole day. And the next day after, the like was done by him at the cross in Cheapside, and in both places he read his confession of which we made mention before; and was from Cheapside conveyed and laid up in the Tower. Notwithstanding all this the King was (as was partly touched before) grown to be such a partner with fortune, as no body could tell what actions the one and what the other owned. For it was believed generally that Perkin was betrayed; and that this escape was not with-

[1] I suppose he was under what they call *surveillance;* for according to the Chronicle (fo. 172), the King "kept him in his Court at liberty."

[2] "Upon Trinity Sunday even, upon Saturday the 9th of June," 1498. (Old Chron. f. 172.)

[3] "On the Friday next following." Id. fo. 172. *b.*

out the King's privity, who had him all the time of his flight in a line; and that the King did this to pick a quarrel to him, to put him to death, and to be rid of him at once; which is not probable;[1] for that the same instruments who observed him in his flight might have kept him from getting into sanctuary.

But it was ordained that this winding-ivy of a Plantagenet should kill the true tree itself. For Perkin after he had been a while in the Tower, began to insinuate himself into the favour and kindness of his keepers; servants to the Lieutenant of the Tower Sir John Digby; being four in number; Strangeways, Blewet, Astwood, and Long-Roger. These varlets with mountains of promises he sought to corrupt, to obtain his escape. But knowing well that his own fortunes were made so contemptible as he could feed no man's hopes; and by hopes he must work, for rewards he had none; he had contrived with himself a vast and tragical plot; which was, to draw into his company Edward Plantagenet Earl of Warwick, then prisoner in the Tower, whom the weary life of a long imprisonment, and the often and renewing fears of being put to death, had softened to take any impression of counsel for his liberty. This young Prince he thought these servants would look upon, though not upon himself. And therefore after that by some message by one or two of them he had tasted of the Earl's consent, it was agreed that these four should murder their master the Lieutenant secretly in the night, and make their best of such money and portable goods of his as they should find ready at hand; and get the keys of the Tower, and presently to let

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has: "But this is not probable."

forth Perkin and the Earl. But this conspiracy was revealed in time before it could be executed. And in this again the opinion of the King's great wisdom did surcharge him with a sinister fame, that Perkin was but his bait to entrap the Earl of Warwick. And in the very instant while this conspiracy was in working (as if that also had been the King's industry) it was fatal that there should break forth a counterfeit Earl of Warwick, a cordwainer's son, whose name was Ralph Wilford, a young man taught and set on by an Augustin Friar called Patrick. They both from the parts of Suffolk came forwards into Kent, where they did not only privily and underhand give out that this Wilford was the true Earl of Warwick; but also the friar, finding some light credence in the people, took the boldness in the pulpit to declare as much, and to incite the people to come in to his aid. Whereupon they were both presently apprehended, and the young fellow executed,[1] and the friar condemned to perpetual imprisonment. This also happening so opportunely to represent the danger to the King's estate from the Earl of Warwick, and thereby to colour the King's severity that followed; together with the madness of the friar, so vainly and desperately to divulge a treason before it had gotten any manner of strength; and the saving of the friar's life, which nevertheless was indeed but the privilege of his order; and the pity in the common people (which if it run in a strong stream doth ever cast up scandal and envy), made it generally rather talked than believed that all was but the King's device. But howsoever it were, hereupon

[1] He was hanged on Shrove-Tuesday, which in 1498–9 fell on the 13th of February. Old Chron. fo. 174. *b.* and Speed.

Perkin (that had offended against grace now the third time) was at the last proceeded with, and by commissioners of Oyer and Determiner arraigned at Westminster,[1] upon divers treasons committed and perpetrated after his coming on land within this kingdom (for so the judges advised, for that he was a foreigner), and condemned; and a few days after executed at Tyburn; where he did again openly read his confession, and take it upon his death to be true. This was the end of this little cockatrice of a King, that was able to destroy those that did not espy him first. It was one of the longest plays of that kind that hath been in memory, and might perhaps have had another end, if he had not met with a King both wise, stout, and fortunate.

As for Perkin's three counsellors, they had registered themselves sanctuary-men, when their master did; and whether upon pardon obtained or continuance within the privilege, they came not to be proceeded with.

There was executed with Perkin the Mayor of Cork and his son, who had been principal abettors of his treasons. And soon after were likewise condemned eight other persons about the Tower-conspiracy; whereof four were the Lieutenant's men. But of those eight but two were executed.[2] And immediately after was arraigned before the Earl of Oxford (then for the time High Steward of England) the poor Prince the Earl of Warwick; not for the attempt to escape simply, for that was not acted; and besides the imprisonment not being for treason, the escape

[1] On the 16th of November, 1499.
[2] This is omitted in the translation.

by law could not be treason; but for conspiring with Perkin to raise sedition, and to destroy the King. And the Earl confessing the indictment had judgment, and was shortly after beheaded on Tower-hill.[1]

This was also the end not only of this noble and commiserable[2] person Edward the Earl of Warwick, eldest son to the Duke of Clarence, but likewise of the line-male of the Plantagenets, which had flourished in great royalty and renown from the time of the famous King of England, King Henry the Second. Howbeit it was a race often dipped in their own blood. It hath remained since, only transplanted into other names, as well of the imperial line as of other noble houses. But it was neither guilt of crime, nor reason of state, that could quench the envy that was upon the King for this execution. So that he thought good to export it out of the land, and to lay it upon his new ally Ferdinando King of Spain. For these two Kings understanding one another at half a word, so it was that there were letters shewed out of Spain, whereby in the passages concerning the treaty of the marriage, Ferdinando had written to the King in plain terms that he saw no assurance of his succession as long as the Earl of Warwick lived; and that he was loth to send his daughter to troubles and dangers. But hereby as the King did in some part remove the envy from himself, so he did not observe that he did withal bring a kind of malediction and infausting upon the marriage, as an ill prognostic; which in event so far proved true, as both Prince Arthur enjoyed a very small time after

[1] He was arraigned on the 19th and beheaded on the 29th of November. For a statement of the grounds of the arraignment, see Statutes of the Realm, p. 685. l. 7.

[2] *Vere commiserabilis.*

the marriage; and the Lady Katherine herself (a sad and a religious woman) long after, when King Henry the Eighth his resolution of a divorce from her was first made known to her, used some words, that she had not offended, but it was a judgment of God, for that her former marriage was made in blood; meaning that of the Earl of Warwick.[1]

[1] Sir James Mackintosh construes these remarks, coupled with another a little further on (see note 2. p. 317), into a reluctant admission (for he chooses to regard everything that Bacon mentions to Henry's disadvantage as a reluctant admission) that the execution of Warwick had been determined on beforehand between Henry and Ferdinand, and that his offence was the result of a snare laid by Henry in order to bring it about. It does not seem to me that Bacon believed so much as this, or that the evidence requires us to believe it. Bacon appears to have thought that Henry's *real motive* for this unjustifiable severity was state-policy: the desire to put an end at last to these dangers and troubles; that the laying it upon Ferdinand was a *pretext*, to shift the unpopularity of the act from himself; and that Ferdinand, understanding the case and having himself an interest in it, had been willing to play into his hands and provide him with this pretext in case he should want it; which it was obvious that he very likely might. As long as a male representative of the house of York lived, Yorkist conspiracies were continually hatching against Henry, upon various pretences, but always with the one ultimate aim of reinstating the true heir on the throne. Whatever impostor might be put forward for convenience, it was in the true heir alone that the hopes of all the conspirators could meet and rest, and the chances therefore were that he would sooner or later be drawn into some plot which would involve him in a charge of treason. The question would *then* arise whether in such a case as Warwick's — a case so extremely cruel and unjust — the rigour of the law could be allowed to take its course. That it would be *convenient* it should, it is idle to deny. What Ferdinand is represented to have said was quite true: as long as the Earl of Warwick lived, the succession was not secure. That in the course of a negotiation for the marriage of his daughter he should put this fact strongly forward as a set-off against the advantages of the match, was natural and no way wrong: it *was* a very material objection. This would of itself account for the occurrence of such passages in his letters as are said to have been shown after the execution of Warwick; and would of itself bear out the whole of Bacon's statement as to the *facts*. The expression "understanding each other at half a word" does indeed imply something more as to Bacon's *opinion*. It implies an impression on his mind that there had been some collusion between the two Kings on the subject; that Ferdinand had done

This fifteenth year of the King, there was a great plague both in London and in divers parts of the kingdom. Wherefore the King after often change of places, whether to avoid the danger of the sickness, or to give

more than merely urge this point in his letters as making against the eligibility of the match (which he might certainly have done without any blame); that he had foreseen the use which Henry might make of such a pretext if he should have occasion to use unpopular severity towards Warwick, and had therefore the rather dwelt upon it.

Bacon may have had grounds for such an impression, independent of the rumour mentioned in the old histories. He may very likely have seen the letters he speaks of. But I do not think we are at liberty to conclude that his opinion went further than this. If he had believed as much as Sir James Mackintosh supposes him to admit, it is difficult to see why he did not adopt the narrative of Speed, who not only represents Warwick as entrapped into the conspiracy, but connects the plea for entrapping him with the case of Ralph Wilford that has just been mentioned: a theory with which, if other circumstances corroborated it, the dates suit very well. Wilford's conspiracy was in February, 1498–9. "This new device (says Speed) to uncrown King Henry so wakened his own fears and the eyes of the Castilians (who had secretly agreed to marry their princess Katherine to our prince Arthur) that there seemed no sure ground of succession if that the Earl of Warwick were not made away. . . . . But oh the narrow capacities of the most seeing men; *the confidence whereof did undoubtedly lead this King* (herein not justifiable, howsoever excusable in respect of human frailty, which might propound to itself many fears and respects both public and private) *to connive at the plotted death, or rather formal murder, of this harmless gentleman*, whose wrong may yet move the hardest to compassion, as it afterwards stirred God in justice to revenge, prospering no part of that great work which was therefore thus corruptly sought to be perpetuated." This is the "sinister fame" which Bacon mentions as having been current at the time, but not as believed by himself; as having been naturally suggested by that singular sequence of events; but not as being the true explanation of them. It may easily be supposed that Bacon and Speed had the very same evidence before them, but drew different conclusions from it.

My own difficulty is to understand how Henry could expect to relieve himself from any part of the odium of the business by laying it upon Ferdinand. One would think that the avowal of such a motive would only have made the act more odious than ever. But I suppose Ferdinand, being a great man and in alliance with England against France, was a popular favourite in England, and the match was popular; and the people, with true popular partiality, were disposed to excuse in the one the same crime which they abhorred in the other.

occasion of an interview with the Archduke, or both, sailed over with his Queen to Calais. Upon his coming thither the Archduke sent an honourable ambassage unto him, as well to welcome him into those parts, as to let him know that if it pleased him he would come and do him reverence. But it was said withal, that the King might be pleased to appoint some place that were out of any walled town or fortress, for that he had denied the same upon like occasion to the French King. And though he said he made a great difference between the two Kings, yet he would be loth to give a precedent, that might make it after to be expected at his hands by another whom he trusted less. The King accepted of the courtesy, and admitted of his excuse, and appointed the place to be at Saint Peter's Church without Calais. But withal he did visit the Archduke with ambassadors sent from himself, which were the Lord St. John and the secretary, unto whom the Archduke did the honour as (going to mass at St. Omer's) to set the Lord Saint John on his right hand and the secretary on his left, and so to ride between them to church. The day appointed for the interview the King went on horseback some distance from Saint Peter's Church to receive the Archduke. And upon their approaching, the Archduke made haste to light, and offered to hold the King's stirrup at his alighting, which he[1] would not permit, but descending from horseback they embraced with great affection. And withdrawing into the church to a place prepared, they had long conference, not only upon the confirmation of former treaties,[2] and the freeing of com-

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "which the King would not," &c.

[2] Some new regulations concerning the packers of wool, &c., and the

merce,[1] but upon cross-marriages to be had between the Duke of York the King's second son, and the Archduke's daughter; and again between Charles the Archduke's son and heir, and Mary the King's second daughter. But these blossoms of unripe marriages were but of[2] friendly wishes, and the airs of loving entertainment; though one of them came afterwards to a conclusion[3] in treaty, though not in effect. But during the time that the two Princes conversed and communed together in the suburbs of Calais, the demonstrations on both sides were passing hearty and affectionate; especially on the part of the Archduke; who (besides that he was a Prince of an excellent good nature) being conscious to himself how drily[4] the King had been used by his counsel in the matter of Perkin, did strive by all means to recover it in the King's affection. And having also his ears continually beaten with the counsels of his father and father-in-law, who in respect of their jealous hatred against the French King did always advise the Archduke to anchor himself upon the amity of King Henry of England, was glad upon this occasion to put in ure and practice their precepts: calling the King patron, and father, and protector, (these very words the King repeats, when he certified

sale of English cloths at Antwerp and Barugh, in the Archduke's dominions, had been agreed upon between Henry and Philip in the spring of 1499. The sheriffs were directed to proclaim it on the 29th of May of that year. See Cal. Pat. Rolls, 14 Hen. VII. fo. 3. p. 26.

[1] So Ed. 1622. The MS. has "comen," but a blank space is left between the *n* and the comma which follows, as if the transcriber had felt that it was not the right word, and left that space for the insertion of the proper letter at the end.

[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 omits "of."

[3] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "to conclusion." The treaty alluded to was for a marriage between Charles and Mary.

[4] *Morose et parum amanter.*

of the loving behaviour of the Archduke to the city,[1]) and what else he could devise to express his love and observance to the King. There came also to the King the Governor of Picardy and the Bailiff of Amiens, sent from Lewis the French King to do him honour, and to give him knowledge of his victory and winning of the duchy of Milan. It seemeth the King was well pleased with the honours he received from those parts, while he was at Calais; for he did himself certify all the news and occurrents of them in every particular from Calais to the Mayor and Aldermen of London, which no doubt made no small talk in the City. For the King, though he could not entertain the good-will of the citizens as Edward the Fourth did, yet by affability and other princely graces did ever make very much of them, and apply himself to them.

This year also died John Morton,[2] Archbishop of Canterbury, Chancellor of England, and Cardinal. He was a wise man and an eloquent, but in his nature harsh and haughty, much accepted by the King, but envied by the nobility and hated of the people.

[1] *Literis suis postea inseruit ad civitatem Londini missis, quibus humanitatem Archiducis prolixe commendavit.*

There is a copy of this letter in the old Chronicle (Vitel. A. xvi. fo. 178. *b.*) from which most of the particulars here given may have been taken. The chief difference is in a thing of very small importance — the sequence of the two embassies; which Bacon appears to have inverted. According to the King's letter, his embassy to the Archduke which was received with such distinction at St. Omer's was prior to the Archduke's message mentioned above. Henry's embassy was sent in acknowledgment of some former embassy of the Archduke's; the Archduke's message in acknowledgment of this. The King's letter is dated Calais, June 2; and was written before his personal interview with the Archduke: which was to be on the Monday or Tuesday in Whitsun week. *i. e.* the 8th or 9th of June.

[2] In the beginning of October, according to the old Chronicle, p. 181. *b.* Reckoning by the years of the King's reign, it should have been not *this* year, but the next, the 16th.

Neither was his name left out of Perkin's proclamation[1] for any good will; but they would not bring him in amongst the King's casting counters, because he had the image and superscription upon him of the Pope, in his honour of Cardinal. He wanne the King with secrecy and diligence, but chiefly because he was his old servant in his less fortunes, and also for that in his affections he was not without an inveterate malice against the house of York, under whom he had been in trouble. He was willing also to take envy from the King more than the King was willing to put upon him. For the King cared not for subterfuges, but would stand envy, and appear in any thing that was to his mind; which made envy still grow upon him; more universal, but less daring. But in the matter of exactions, time did after shew that the Bishop in feeding the King's humour did rather temper it. He had been by Richard the Third committed as in custody to the Duke of Buckingham, whom he did secretly incite to revolt from King Richard. But after the Duke was engaged, and thought the Bishop should have been his chief pilot in the tempest, the Bishop was gotten into the cock-boat, and fled over beyond seas. But whatsoever else was in the man,[2] he deserveth a most happy memory, in that he was the principal means of joining the two Roses. He died of great years, but of strong health and powers.[3]

[1] *Neque ex benevolentiâ aliquâ nomen ejus omissum est in catalogo adulatorum regis quos edictum Perkini perstrinxit; sed eum noluerunt cum reliquis admiscere quoniam*, &c.

[2] *Utcumque iste vir laudandus aut reprehendendus occurrat.*

[3] *Corpore validus et animi facultatibus integris.*

The old Chronicle says that he died "passing the years of fourscore and odd."

The next year, which was the sixteenth year of the King and the year of our Lord one thousand five hundred, was the year of jubilee at Rome.[1] But Pope Alexander, to save the hazard and charges of men's journeys to Rome, thought good to make over those graces by exchange to such as would pay a convenient rate, seeing they could not come to fetch them.[2] For which purpose was sent into England Gasper Pons a Spaniard, the Pope's commissioner, better chosen than were the commissioners of Pope Leo afterwards employed for Germany; for he carried the business with great wisdom and semblance of holiness: insomuch as he levied great sums of money within this land to the Pope's use, with little or no scandal. It was thought[3] the King shared in the money. But it appeareth by a letter[4] which Cardinal Adrian, the King's pensioner, writ to the King from Rome some few years after, that

[1] The year of Jubilee extended from Christmas 1499, to Christmas 1500. Therefore it coincided more nearly with the King's 15th year. Jasper Pons came in 1499–1500.

[2] *Cum minus grave esset eos in patriâ quemque suâ recipere.*

[3] *Opinio prava increbuerat.*

[4] This letter or one to the same effect is still to be seen in the Cotton collection. (Cleo. E. iii. fo. 164.) It contains the following passage; probably the one of which Bacon was thinking, though it does not appear to me to be quite decisive upon the point specially in question. "*Dixi et prædicavi, quod est verum, vestram Majestatem solum fuisse inter omnes Catholicos principes qui non solum admisit pro sede Apostolica dictas cruciatas et subsidia, sed etiam antequam colligerentur de suis propriis pecuniis 20ti millia scutorum auri sedi Apostolicæ solvenda hic Romæ præmisisse et oratori Apostolicæ magistro Pon deliberasse.*"

It appears from Henry's Privy Purse expences that on the 16th of September, 1502, there was "delivered to Gasper Pon the Pope's orator, by the King's commandment, for and unto the Pope's use, 4000*l.*" Nicolas's Excerpt. Hist. p. 126.

Henry may possibly have repaid himself for this advance out of the money raised by Pons: and thence may have arisen the report that he shared in the money. I suppose it may easily have taken two years to complete the collection.

this was not so. For this Cardinal, being to persuade Pope Julius on the King's behalf to expedite the bull of dispensation for the marriage between Prince Henry and the Lady Katherine, finding the Pope difficile in granting thereof, doth use it as a principal argument concerning the King's merit towards that see, that he had touched none of those deniers which had been levied by Pons in England. But that it might the better appear (for the satisfaction of the common people) that this was consecrate money, the same nuncio brought unto the King a brief from the Pope, wherein the King was exhorted and summoned to come in person against the Turk. For that the Pope, out of the care of an universal father, seeing almost under his eyes the successes and progresses of that great enemy of the faith,[1] had had in the conclave, and with the assistance of the ambassadors of foreign Princes, divers consultations about an holy war and general expedition of Christian Princes against the Turk. Wherein it was agreed and thought fit, that the Hungarians, Polonians, and Bohemians, should make a war upon Thracia: the French and Spaniards upon Græcia; and that the Pope (willing to sacrifice himself in so good a cause) in person, and in company of the King of England, the Venetians, (and such other states as were great in maritime power), would sail with a puissant navy through the Mediterrane unto Constantinople. And that to this end his Holiness had sent nuncios to all Christian Princes, as well for a cessation of all quarrels and differences amongst themselves, as for

[1] "Also this year," says the old Chronicle, fo. 182., "come certain tidings to the King that the Turk had gotten the town Modon and made great destruction of the Christians."

speedy preparations and contributions of forces and treasure for this sacred enterprise. To this the King (who understood well the court of Rome)[1] made an answer[2] rather solemn than serious. Signifying that no Prince on earth should be more forward and obedient both by his person and by all his possible forces and fortunes to enter into this sacred war than himself. But that the distance of place was such, as no forces that he should raise for the seas could be levied or prepared but with double the charge and double the time (at the least) that they might be from the other Princes that had their territories nearer adjoining. Besides, that neither the manner of his ships (having no galleys) nor the experience of his pilots and mariners could be so apt for those seas as theirs. And therefore that his Holiness might do well to move one of those other Kings, who lay fitter for the purpose, to accompany him by sea, whereby both all things would be sooner put in readiness, and with less charge; and the emulation and division of command which might grow between those Kings of France and Spain, if they should both join in the war by land upon Græcia, might be wisely avoided. And that for his part he would not be wanting in aids and contribution. Yet notwithstanding if both these Kings should refuse, rather than his Holiness should go alone, he would wait upon him as soon as he could be ready. Always provided that he might first see all differences of the Christian Princes amongst themselves fully laid

[1] *De animo et consiliis Papæ bene informatus.*

[2] The answer may be read at length in Ellis's letters, 1st ser. vol. i. p. 48; where it is printed from the original Cott. MSS. Cleo. E. iii. fo. 150. This which Bacon gives is only the substance of the business part of it.

down and appeased, (as for his own part he was in none.) And that he might have some good towns upon the coast in Italy put into his hands, for the retreat and safeguard of his men. With this answer Gasper Pons returned, nothing at all discontented.

And yet this declaration of the King (as superficial as it was) gave him that reputation abroad, as he was not long after elected by the Knights of the Rhodes protector of their order; all things multiplying to honour in a prince that had gotten such high estimation for his wisdom and sufficiency.[1]

There were these two last years some proceedings against heretics, which was rare in this King's reign; and rather by penances than by fire.[2] The King had (though he were no good schoolman) the honour to convert one of them[3] by dispute at Canterbury.

This year also, though the King were no more haunted with sprites, for that by the sprinkling partly of blood and partly of water he had chased them away; yet nevertheless he had certain apparitions that troubled him: still shewing themselves from one region, which was the house of York. It came so to pass that the Earl of Suffolk, son to Elizabeth eldest sister to King Edward the Fourth by John Duke of Suffolk her second husband, and brother to John Earl

[1] *In rebus civilibus peritiæ.*

[2] *Et si aliquando contigerat, pœnitentiis potius quam igne luebant.*

[3] This is recorded by the city Chronicler (p. 172.) who adds that he "died a Christian man, whereof his Grace have great honour."

"The King (says Fuller) by what arguments we know not, converted this priest and then presently gave order that he should be burned; which was done accordingly. Surely there was more in the matter than what appeared in the record, or else one may boldly say that, if the King's converts had no better encouragement, this was the first he made and the last he was ever likely to make." Church History, iv. 15. 82.

of Lincoln, that was slain at Stokefield, being of a hasty and choleric disposition, had killed a man in his fury. Whereupon the King gave him his pardon, but either willing to leave a cloud upon him or the better to make him feel his grace, produced him openly to plead his pardon. This wrought in the Earl, as in a haughty stomach it useth to do. For the ignominy printed deeper than the grace. Wherefore he being discontent fled secretly into Flanders[1] unto his aunt the Duchess of Burgundy. The King startled at it. But being taught by troubles to use fair and timely remedies, wrought so with him by messages (the Lady Margaret also growing by often failing in her alchemy weary of her experiments, and partly being a little sweetened for that the King had not touched her name in the confession of Perkin,) that he came over again upon good terms, and was reconciled to the King.

In the beginning of the next year, being the seventeenth of the King, the Lady Katherine, fourth daughter of Ferdinando and Isabella, King and Queen of Spain, arrived in England at Plymouth the second of October, and was married to Prince Arthur in Paul's the fourteenth of November following: the Prince being then about fifteen years of age, and the lady about eighteen.[2] The manner of her receiving, the

[1] In the month of August. Old Chron. fo. 183.

It seems the Earl had another ground of discontent. His elder brother John had been attainted during the Duke their father's life; when the Duke died Edmond claimed the honour and estate of his father. But Henry persisted in considering him as the heir of his brother, and gave him only the title of Earl, with a small portion of his patrimony; — an instance of the troubles Henry bred himself from his aversion to the House of York.

[2] So say both Stowe and Speed: but it seems to be a mistake. Miss Strickland, on the authority of a Spanish MS. in the possession of Sir

manner of her entry into London, and the celebrity of the marriage, were performed with great and true magnificence, in regard of cost, shew, and order.[1] The chief man that took the care was Bishop Foxe, who was not only a grave counsellor for war or peace, but also a good surveyor of works, and a good master of ceremonies, and any thing else that was fit for the active part belonging to the service of court or state of a great King. This marriage was almost seven years in treaty, which was in part caused by the tender years of the marriage-couple; especially of the Prince. But the true reason was that these two Princes, being Princes of great policy and profound judgment, stood a great time looking one upon another's fortunes, how they would go;[2] knowing well

Thomas Phillips, states that Katherine was born on the 15th of December, 1485: therefore was not quite sixteen at the time of her marriage.

[1] See a full account of it in the old Chronicle, p. 183. *b.* — 201.

[2] This is the passage referred to in note 1. p. 306. It is quoted by Sir James Mackintosh as imputing to Henry and Ferdinand (clearly though not directly) a "criminal agreement" for the removal of Warwick. He could hardly, I think, have remembered his own admission that "history ought to be written without passion," when he found such a meaning in these words. Dr. Lingard's remark is more pertinent. "As almost three years elapsed (he says) between the treaty of marriage and the contract, this delay has been urged as a proof that Ferdinand would not consent to it till he was assured that the life of the Earl of Warwick, the real heir, would be taken by Henry. But the fact is that this was the earliest period stipulated in the treaty (Rymer, xii. 668.), which provided that as soon as Arthur had completed his twelfth year, the parents might, if they pleased, apply to the Pope for a dispensation." This seems to be a sufficient answer to Sir James Mackintosh's question "How came the espousal by proxy to occur only six months before the execution of Warwick, &c.?". Arthur had not completed his twelfth year till September, 1498. And if it be asked why this delay was provided for in the contract (marriages between children being in such cases — where Kings were the matchmakers and kingdoms the parties matched — not unusual), the reason here assigned by Bacon — if the obvious rationality and decency of the proceeding be not thought reason enough — is probably the true

mean time the very treaty itself gave road in the world a reputation of a strait conjunction and amity between them, which served on both sides to many purposes that their several affairs required, and yet they continued still free. But in the end, when the fortunes of both the Princes did grow every day more and more prosperous and assured, and

one. As no good could be got by closing the question, they thought it better to leave it open.

The thing which requires explanation is not the *delay* of the match, but the resolution to expedite it. It was first agreed upon in general terms on the 27th of March, 1489, before Arthur was three years old. On the 2nd of November, 1491, Katherine's dowry was settled, and it was agreed that she should be brought to England as soon as Arthur had completed his *fourteenth* year. On the 22nd of September, 1496, it was further agreed that as soon as the parties should be of "legitimate age" for it, the marriage should be celebrated "*per verba de præsenti.*" And on the first of October following it was arranged that, *if* for any urgent cause it were thought fit that the marriage should be celebrated *per verba de præsenti* as soon as Arthur had completed his *twelfth* year, then the two Kings would apply for a dispensation for that purpose. This I suppose was the treaty in which D'Ayala was concerned. Henry seems to have been in no hurry about it; for though concluded on the 1st of October, 1496, it was not confirmed by him till the 18th July, 1497. On the 15th of the following month the contract was solemnised at Woodstock as formally as it could be without the Pope's dispensation and while the parties were under age. The dispensation was granted in February, 1497–8. Arthur completed his twelfth year in the following September. On the 12th of March, 1498–9, Katherine appointed her procurator. On the 19th of May the marriage was solemnised by proxy. On the 20th of December the proxy marriage was acknowledged by Katherine and approved by Ferdinand and Isabella. On the 28th of May, 1500, the whole proceeding was formally recited and ratified by Henry. And four months had still to pass before the earliest time ever thought of for the actual union. If it be asked why it was resolved to celebrate the proxy marriage sooner than was originally intended (a resolution which seems to have been taken in October, 1496), the answer is simple and obvious. By the original treaty, Ferdinand had engaged to send his daughter to England *at his own charge* as soon as Arthur had completed his fourteenth year; which would be in September, 1500. And he naturally wished, before he commenced his preparations for sending her, to have the contract made irrevocable and indissoluble.

that looking all about them they saw no better conditions, they shut it up.

The marriage-money the Princess brought (which was turned over to the King by act of renunciation) was two hundred thousand ducats: whereof one hundred thousand were payable ten days after the solemnization, and the other hundred thousand at two payments annual; but part of it to be in jewels and plate, and a due course set down to have them justly and indifferently priced.[1] The jointure or advancement of the lady, was the third part of the principality of Wales, and of the dukedom of Cornwall, and of the earldom of Chester; to be after set forth in severalty. And in case she came to be Queen of England her advancement was left indefinite; but thus; that it should be as great as ever any former Queen of England had.

In all the devices and conceits of the triumphs of this marriage, there was a great deal of astronomy. The lady being resembled to Hesperus, and the Prince to Arcturus; and the old King Alphonsus (that was the greatest astronomer of Kings and was ancestor to the lady) was brought in to be the fortune-teller of the match. And whosoever had those toys in compiling, they were not altogether pedantical. But you may be sure that King Arthur the Briton, and the descent of the Lady Katherine from the house of Lancaster, was in no wise forgotten. But as it should seem, it is not good to fetch fortunes from the stars. For this young Prince (that drew upon him at that time not only the hopes and affections of his country, but the eyes and expectation of foreigners) after a few

[1] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "prized."

months, in the beginning of April, deceased at Ludlow Castle, where he was sent to keep his resiance and court as Prince of Wales. Of this Prince, in respect he died so young, and by reason of his father's manner of education, that did cast no great lustre upon his children, there is little particular memory. Only thus much remaineth, that he was very studious and learned beyond his years, and beyond the custom of great Princes.

There was a doubt ripped up in the times following, when the divorce of King Henry the Eighth from the Lady Katherine did so much busy the world, whether Arthur was bedded with his lady or no, whereby that matter in fact (of carnal knowledge) might be made part of the case. And it is true that the lady herself denied it, or at least her counsel stood upon it, and would not blanch that advantage;[1] although the plenitude of the Pope's power of dispensing was the main question. And this doubt was kept long open in respect of the two Queens that succeeded, Mary and Elizabeth, whose legitimations were incompatible one with another; though their succession was settled by act of Parliament. And the times that favoured Queen Mary's legitimation would have it believed that there was no carnal knowledge between Arthur and Katherine; not that they would seem to derogate from the Pope's absolute power to dispense even in that case; but only in point of honour, and to make the case more favourable and smooth. And the times that favoured Queen Elizabeth's legitimation (which were the longer and the later) maintained the contrary. So much there remaineth in memory; that it was half

[1] *Ut firmamentum causæ non contemnendum omitti noluisse.*

a year's time[1] between the creation of Henry Prince of Wales and Prince Arthur's death; which was construed to be, for to expect a full time whereby it might appear whether the Lady Katherine were with child by Prince Arthur or no. Again the lady herself procured a bull for the better corroboration of the marriage, with a clause of (*vel forsan cognitam*) which was not in the first bull. There was given in evidence also when the cause of the divorce was handled, a pleasant passage,[2] which was; that in a morning Prince Arthur upon his up-rising from bed with her called for drink, which he was not accustomed to do, and finding the gentleman of his chamber that brought him the drink to smile at it and to note it, he said merrily to him that he had been in the midst of Spain which was an hot region, and his journey had made him dry; and that if the other had been in so hot a clime he would have been drier than he. Besides the Prince was upon the point of sixteen years of age[3] when he died, and forward, and able in body.

The February following, Henry Duke of York was created Prince of Wales, and Earl of Chester and Flint. For the dukedom of Cornwall devolved to him by statute. The King also being fast-handed[4] and loth to part with a second dowry, but chiefly being affectionate both by his nature and out of politic

[1] Nearly a year. Prince Arthur died about the 2nd of April, 1502. Prince Henry was created Prince of Wales on the 18th of February following.

[2] *Scomma quoddam facetum.*

[3] About fifteen and a half.

[4] *At rex ingenio tenax, et non libenter reditus novos, si alibi nupsisset Henricus, assignaturus; sed præcipue propter affectum suum, quo et naturâ et propter rationes politicas Ferdinandum prosecutus est, affinitatis prioris continuandi cupidus, &c.*

considerations to continue the alliance with Spain, prevailed with the Prince (though not without some reluctation,[1] such as could be in those years, for he was not twelve years of age) to be contracted with the Princess Katherine: the secret providence of God ordaining that marriage to be the occasion of great events and changes.

The same year were the espousals of James King of Scotland with the Lady Margaret the King's eldest daughter; which was done by proxy, and published at Paul's Cross, the five and twentieth of January, and Te Deum solemnly sung. But certain it is, that the joy of the City thereupon shewed, by ringing of bells and bonfires and such other incense of the people, was more than could be expected in a case of so great and fresh enmity between the nations; especially in London, which was far enough off from feeling any of

[1] Bacon's authority for this statement was probably Speed, who asserts it, on the strength apparently of Prince Henry's protestation, made on the 27th of June, 1505, when he was just turned fourteen. According to Dr. Lingard, however, this protestation was dictated by his father, and was not intended to imply any objection on the part of young Henry to marry Katherine, but only to leave him free. "The King assured Ferdinand (says Lingard) that his only object was to free his son from all previous obligation; he still wished to marry Katherine, but was also free to marry any other woman." (Chap. 6. p. 329.) Dr. Lingard also represents the proposition for this marriage as having come from Ferdinand and Isabella, and as one on which Ferdinand was much bent: which Henry knew, and kept the question open in order to engage him in furtherance of some matrimonial projects of his own.

Sir Richard Morysine in his *Apomaxis calumniarum, &c.* (1537) states that Henry himself afterwards, taking the failure of his own health and the death of his Queen (quam merito suo unice deamabat) as intimations of the divine displeasure at this contract, sent for his son, told him it was wrong to think that God's laws were not God's laws when the Pope chose, obtained a promise from him that he would not marry his brother's widow, and formally annulled the contract. And I believe that evidence in confirmation of this statement has recently been discovered.

the former calamities of the war: and therefore might truly be attributed to a secret instinct and inspiring (which many times runneth not only in the hearts of Princes but in the pulse and veins of people) touching the happiness thereby to ensue in time to come. This marriage was in August following consummate at Edinburgh: the King bringing his daughter as far as Collyweston on the way; and then consigning her to the attendance of the Earl of Northumberland; who with a great troop of lords and ladies of honour brought her into Scotland to the King her husband. This marriage had been in treaty by the space of almost three years,[1] from the time that the King of Scotland did first open his mind to Bishop Foxe. The sum given in marriage by the King was ten thousand pounds: and the jointure and advancement assured by the King of Scotland was two thousand pounds a year after King James his death, and one thousand pounds a year in present for the lady's allowance or maintenance: this to be set forth in lands, of the best and most certain revenue.[2] During the treaty it is reported that the King remitted the matter to his counsel, and that some of the table in the freedom of counsellors (the King being present) did put the case, — that if God should take the King's two sons without issue, that then the kingdom of England would fall to the King of Scotland, which might prejudice the monarchy of England. Whereunto the King himself replied; That if that should be, Scotland would be but an accession to England, and not England to Scotland; for that the

[1] Rather more than three years. Fox was formally commissioned to treat of the marriage on the 11th September, 1499.

[2] *Qui reditus separandi erant ex præcipuis et certissimis reditibus.*

greater would draw the less: and that it was a safer union for England than that of France. This passed as an oracle, and silenced those that moved the question.

The same year was fatal as well for deaths as marriages; and that with equal temper. For the joys and feasts of the two marriages were compensed with the mournings and funerals of Prince Arthur (of whom we have spoken), and of Queen Elizabeth, who died in child-bed in the Tower, and the child lived not long after. There died also that year Sir Reignold Bray, who was noted to have had with the King the greatest freedom of any counsellor; but it was but a freedom the better to set off flattery; yet he bare more than his just part of envy for the exactions.

At this time the King's estate was very prosperous: secured by the amity of Scotland; strengthened by that of Spain; cherished by that of Burgundy; all domestic troubles quenched; and all noise of war (like a thunder afar off) going upon Italy. Wherefore nature, which many times is happily contained and refrained by some bands of fortune, began to take place[1] in the King; carrying as with a strong tide his affections and thoughts unto the gathering and heaping up of treasure. And as Kings do more easily find instruments for their will and humour than for their service and honour, he had gotten for his purpose, or beyond his purpose, two instruments, Empson and Dudley; whom the people esteemed as his horse-leeches and shearers: bold men and careless of fame, and that took toll of their master's grist. Dudley was of a good family, eloquent, and one that could put hateful

[1] *Prævalere et prædominari effrænis.*

business into good language. But Empson, that was the son of a sieve-maker, triumphed always upon the deed done;[1] putting off all other respects whatsoever. These two persons being lawyers in science and privy counsellors in authority, (as the corruption of the best things is the worst) turned law and justice into wormwood and rapine. For first their manner was to cause divers subjects to be indicted of sundry crimes; and so far forth to proceed in form of law; but when the bills were found, then presently to commit them; and nevertheless not to produce them in any reasonable time[2] to their answer; but to suffer them to languish long in prison, and by sundry artificial devices and terrors to extort from them great fines and ransoms, which they termed compositions and mitigations.

Neither did they, towards the end, observe so much as the half-face of justice,[3] in proceeding by indictment; but sent forth their precepts to attach men and convent them before themselves and some others at their private houses, in a court of commission;[4] and

[1] *Factum semper urgebat deque eo triumphabat.* He was satisfied, so he got the thing done, no matter how: an explanation which I should not have thought it worth while to add, but that Sir James Mackintosh (who had a bad habit of altering Bacon's phraseology to suit his own ideas of elegance, even where he professes by inverted commas to quote the words) substitutes "*triumphed in his deeds:*" an expression which throws the emphasis so effectually on the wrong word that it may be said to miss all the meaning.

[2] *Cum vero billæ impetitionis, quæ vim tantum accusationis non decisionis habebant, veræ repertæ fuerint, statim eos custodiæ tradere. Neque tamen causam juridicâ viâ prosequebantur aut eos tempore convenienti ad se defendendum producebant,* &c.

For "*in* any reasonable time" the Edition of 1622 has "*to* any reasonable time;" a misprint, I presume. The MS. has "in."

[3] *Quinetiam usu audaciores facti, tandem tam contemptim et incuriose processerunt ut ne dimidiam illam partem,* &c.

[4] *Colore scilicet commissionis suæ.*

there used to shuffle up a summary proceeding by examination,[1] without trial of jury; assuming to themselves there[2] to deal both in pleas of the crown and controversies civil.

Then did they also use to inthral and charge the subjects' lands with tenures *in capite*,[3] by finding false offices,[4] and thereby to work upon them for wardships,[5] liveries, premier seisins,[6] and alienations, (being the fruits of those tenures); refusing (upon divers pretexts and delays) to admit men to traverse those false offices, according to the law.

Nay the King's wards after they had accomplished their full age could not be suffered to have livery of their lands without paying excessive fines, far exceeding all reasonable rates.

They did also vex men with information of intrusion,[7] upon scarce colourable titles.

When men were outlawed [8] in personal actions, they would not permit them to purchase their charters of pardon, except they paid great and intolerable sums; standing upon the strict point of law, which upon utlawries giveth forfeiture of goods. Nay contrary to

[1] *Viâ quâdam justitiæ summariâ et irregulari, per examinationem solam, absque duodecim virorum judicio, causas terminabant.*

[2] *In his justitiæ latebris.*

[3] *Tenura immediata de coronâ aut personâ regis; non de baroniâ aut prædio superiore aut hujusmodi.* (Ind. Vocab.)

[4] *Falsas inquisitiones.*

[5] *Jus, per quod custodia hæredum minoris ætatis, qui tenent per servitium equitis, pertinet ad dominum.* Id.

[6] *Jus, domino accrescens, ad summam pecuniæ, quamprimum hæredes sint plenæ ætatis* Id.

[7] *De intrusione in terras regias . . . ex meris calumniis et prætextibus vix probabilibus.*

[8] *Utlegati: Proscripti ex formula legis, vel propter capitalia, vel propter contemptum et contumaciam.* (Ind. Voc.)

all law and colour, they maintained[1] the King ought to have the half of men's lands and rents, during the space of full two years, for a pain in case of utlawry. They would also ruffle with jurors[2] and inforce them to find as they would direct, and (if they did not) convent them, imprison them, and fine them.

These and many other courses,[3] fitter to be buried than repeated, they had of preying upon the people; both like tame hawks for their master, and like wild hawks for themselves; insomuch as they grew to great riches and substance. But their principal working[4] was upon penal laws, wherein they spared none great nor small; nor considered whether the law were possible or impossible, in use or obsolete: but raked over all old and new statutes; though many of them were made with intention rather of terror than of rigour;[5] ever having a rabble of promoters, questmongers, and leading jurors[6] at their command; so as they could have any thing found,[7] either for fact or valuation.

There remaineth to this day a report, that the King was on a time entertained by the Earl of Oxford (that was his principal servant both for war and peace) nobly and sumptuously, at his castle at Henningham. And at the King's going away, the Earl's servants stood in a seemly manner in their livery coats with cognizances ranged on both sides, and made the King a lane. The King called the Earl to him, and said, My

[1] *De proprio addebant.*
[2] *Cum duodecim viris et juratoribus grandioribus minaciter agere.*
[3] *Oppressiones et concussiones.*
[4] *Præcipuum autem eorum flagellum.*
[5] *Quam ut summo jure ageretur.*
[6] *Juratorum pragmaticorum.*
[7] *Veredicto exhiberi et confirmari.*

lord, I have heard much of your hospitality, but I see it is greater than the speech. These handsome gentlemen and yeomen which I see on both sides of me are (sure) your menial servants. The Earl smiled and said, It may please your Grace, that were not for mine ease. They are most of them my retainers,[1] that are comen to do me service at such a time as this, and chiefly to see your Grace. The King started a little, and said, By my faith, (my lord) I thank you for my good cheer, but I may not endure to have my laws broken in my sight. My attorney must speak with you. And it is part of the report, that the Earl compounded for no less than fifteen thousand marks.[2] And to shew further the King's extreme diligence; I do remember to have seen long since a book of accompt of Empson's, that had the King's hand almost to every leaf by way of signing, and was in some places postilled in the margent with the King's hand likewise, where was this remembrance.[3]

[1] *Famuli extraordinarii suis viventes impensis.*

[2] The King visited Lord Oxford on the 6th of August, 1498 (see Privy Purse expenses of Hen. VII. p. 119.), on which occasion this may have happened. A heavier fine for a similar offence was exacted from Lord Abergavenny some years afterwards. In a memorandum of obligations and sums of money received by Edmund Dudley for fines and duties to be paid to the King, of which a copy is preserved in the Harleian collection (1877, f. 47.), the following item appears as belonging to the 23rd year of the reign: —

"Item: delivered three exemplifications under the seal of the L. of King's Bench of the confession and condemnation of the Lord Burgavenny for such retainers as he was indicted of in Kent; which amounteth unto for his part only after the rate of the months 69,900*l.*"

It appears from the Calendar of Patent Rolls (23 Hen. VII. pt. 2. p. 18.) that George Nevile, Knt., Lord Bergevenny received a pardon of all felonies, offences against the forest laws, &c. on the 18th of February, 1507–8: two months before Henry's death. Fabyan mentions his being committed to the Tower "for a certain displeasure which concerned no treason" in May, 1506.

[3] *Memoriola ista Empsoni.*

Item, Received, of such a one, five marks, for a pardon to be procured;[1] and if the pardon do not pass, the money to be repaid; except the party be some other ways satisfied.

And over against this memorandum (of the King's own hand[2]),

Otherwise satisfied.

Which I do the rather mention because it shews in the King a nearness,[3] but yet with a kind of justness. So these little sands and grains of gold and silver (as it seemeth) holp not a little to make up the great heap and bank.

But meanwhile to keep the King awake, the Earl of Suffolk, having been too gay at Prince Arthur's marriage,[4] and sunk himself deep in debt, had yet once more a mind to be a knight-errant, and to seek adventures in foreign parts; and taking his brother with him fled again into Flanders. That no doubt which gave him confidence, was the great murmur of the people against the King's government. And being a man of a light and rash spirit, he thought every vapour would be a tempest. Neither wanted he some party within the kingdom. For the murmur of people

1 *Condonationem A. B. impetrandam.*

2 *Per manum Regis propriam opposita sunt hæc verba.*

3 *Magnam parsimoniam.*

4 This is Polydore's statement, but it is a mistake. The Earl of Suffolk was gone above a month before Katherine arrived. Fabyan and the old Chronicle distinctly state that he departed secretly out of the land in August, 1501; three months before the marriage of Prince Arthur; and the Calendar of Patent Rolls (17 Hen. VII. pt. 2. p. 4.) puts the matter out of doubt; for we there find that on the 8th of October (1501) Sir Robert Lovell was appointed receiver and surveyor of all lands, &c. in Norfolk and Suffolk, late the property of *the rebel Edmund Earl of Suffolk.*

awakes the discontents[1] of nobles, and again that calleth up commonly some head of sedition. The King resorting to his wonted and tried arts, caused Sir Robert Curson, captain of the castle at Hammes, (being at that time beyond sea, and therefore less likely to be wrought upon by the King) to fly from his charge and to feign himself a servant of the Earl's. This knight having insinuated himself into the secrets of the Earl, and finding by him upon whom chiefly he had either hope or hold, advertised the King thereof in great secrecy; but nevertheless maintained his own credit and inward trust with the Earl. Upon whose advertisements, the King attached William Courtney Earl of Devonshire, his brother-in-law,[2] married to the Lady Katherine, daughter to King Edward the Fourth; William Delapole, brother to the Earl of Suffolk; Sir James Tirrell and Sir John Windham, and some other meaner persons, and committed them to custody.[3] George Lord Abergavenny and Sir Thomas Green were at the same time apprehended; but as upon less suspicion, so in a freer restraint, and were soon after delivered. The Earl of Devonshire being interessed in the blood of York, (that was rather feared than nocent,[4]) yet as one that might be the object of others plots and designs, remained prisoner in the Tower during the King's life. William Delapole was also long restrained, though not so straitly. But for Sir James Tirrell (against whom

[1] *Novarum rerum studium.*

[2] *Arctissimâ affinitate cum Rege conjunctus (quippe qui in matrimonium,* &c.). It should have been "his wife's brother-in-law."

[3] About the beginning of March, 1501-2. Old Chron. fo. 201. *b.*

[4] *Qui cum sanguine familiæ Eboracensis tam alto gradu commixtus erat ideoque a rege metuebatur sane, licet omnino insons fuerit.*

the blood of the innocent Princes, Edward the Fifth and his brother, did still cry from under the altar), and Sir John Windham, and the other meaner ones, they were attainted and executed;[1] the two knights beheaded. Nevertheless to confirm the credit of Curson (who belike had not yet done all his feats of activity), there was published at Paul's Cross about the time of the said executions[2] the Pope's bull of excommunication and curse against the Earl of Suffolk and Sir Robert Curson, and some others by name, and likewise in general against all the abettors of the said Earl: wherein it must be confessed, that heaven was made too much to bow to earth, and religion to policy. But soon after,[3] Curson when he saw time returned into England, and withal into wonted favour with the King, but worse fame with the people. Upon whose return the Earl was much dismayed, and seeing himself destitute of hopes (the Lady Margaret also by tract of time and bad success being now become cool in those attempts), after some wandering in France and Germany, and certain little projects (no better than squibs) of an exiled man, being tired out, retired again into the protection of the Archduke Philip in Flanders, who by the death of Isabella was at that time King of Castile, in the right of Joan his wife.

[1] On the 6th of May, 1502 (Stowe).

[2] Later. We learn from Fabyan that they were cursed twice; once on the Sunday before St. Simon and Jude, 1502; which was the 23rd of October; and again on the first Sunday in Lent, 1503; which was the 5th of March.

[3] Not before March, 1502–3. See last note. It appears from the Calendar of Patent Rolls that he received a pardon on the 5th of May, 1504. That he had been acting all the time in the interest and confidence of Henry, is stated on no better authority, I believe, than Polydore's, and may be fairly doubted.

s year, being the nineteenth of his reign,[1] the g called his Parliament, wherein a man may easily guess how absolute the King took himself to be with his Parliament;[2] when Dudley, that was so hateful, was made Speaker of the House of Commons. In this Parliament there were not made many[3] statutes memorable touching public government. But those that were had still the stamp of the King's wisdom and policy.

There was a statute made for the disannulling of all patents of lease or grant to such as came not upon lawful summons to serve the King in his wars, against the enemies or rebels, or that should depart without the King's licence; with an exception of certain persons of the long-robe: providing nevertheless that they

[1] Not *this* year, if by "this" be meant the year of the execution just mentioned. Sir James Tyrrel was executed on the 6th of May, 1502, A. R. 17. Parliament met on the 25th of January, 1503–4, A. R. 19.

[2] This growing "absoluteness of the King with his Parliament," an absoluteness which his son inherited, sufficiently accounts for the discontinuance of the "Great Councils," formerly resorted to by way of feeler or preparative, when in unsettled times the temper of a Parliament could not so well be foreseen. After the 32nd of Henry VIII., in which year the Register of the Privy Council (discontinued or lost since the 13th of Hen. VI.) was ordered to be regularly kept, there is no record I believe of the holding of any such "Great Council." The strange thing is that they should have dropped, not only out of use, but out of memory: a thing so strange that one would doubt whether they ever were in use, if it were not established by evidence direct and incontrovertible. That a foreigner, and a man of no great sagacity, like Polydore Vergil, should overlook the fact, is nothing remarkable; that other popular historians should follow their leader without inquiry, was natural; that so strong an array of negative evidence should be taken by ordinary inquirers as sufficient proof that no such councils had ever been called, was also natural. But that profound constitutional lawyers like Sir Edward Coke, and profound constitutional antiquarians like Sir Robert Cotton, should have met with nothing in their researches to suggest the fact, is a mystery to me.

[3] So MS. *Paucæ admodum latæ sunt leges*, &c. Ed. 1622 has "any."

should have the King's wages from their house,[1] till their return home again. There had been the like made before for offices,[2] and by this statute it was extended to lands. But a man may easily see by many statutes made in this King's time, that the King thought it safest to assist martial law by law of Parliament.

Another statute was made, prohibiting the bringing in of manufactures of silk wrought by itself or mixt with any other thrid.[3] But it was not of stuffs of whole-piece (for that the realm had of them no manufacture in use at that time), but of knit silk or texture of silk; as ribbands, laces, cauls, points, and girdles, &c. which the people of England could then well skill to make. This law pointed at a true principle; That where foreign materials are but superfluities, foreign manufactures should be prohibited. For that will either banish the superfluity, or gain the manufacture.

There was a law also of resumption of patents of gaols, and the reannexing of them to the sheriffwicks;[4] privileged officers being no less an interruption of justice than privileged places.

There was likewise a law to restrain the by-laws or ordinances of corporations, which many times were against the prerogative of the King, the common law of the realm, and the liberty of the subject: being

[1] So MS. and Ed. 1622. The translation has *a primo die profectionis suæ.* There seems to be an error in the English; which should apparently be *from the day of leaving their house.* The words of the act (19 H. 7. c. 1.) are "from the time of coming from his house toward the King," &c.

[2] *Quatenus ad concessiones officiorum civilium.*

[3] *Vel simpliciter vel cum mixturâ alterius fili textæ.* See 19 H. 7. c. 21.

[4] 19 H. 7. c. 10.

fraternities in evil.[1] It was therefore provided, that they should not be put in execution, without the allowance of the chancellor, treasurer, and the two chief justices, or three of them; or of the two justices of circuit where the corporation was.

Another law was in effect to bring in the silver of the realm to the mint, in making all clipped minished or impaired coins of silver not to be current in payments;[2] without giving any remedy of weight;[3] but with an exception only of reasonable wearing; which was as nothing, in respect of the incertainty; and so upon the matter to set the mint on work, and to give way to new coins of silver which should be then minted.[4]

There likewise was a long statute against vagabonds, wherein two things may be noted; the one, the dislike the Parliament had of gaoling of them, as that which was chargeable, pesterous,[5] and of no open example. The other, that in the statutes of this King's time (for this of the nineteenth year is not the only statute of that kind) there are ever coupled the punishment of vagabonds, and the forbidding of dice and cards and unlawful games unto servants and mean people, and the putting down and suppressing of ale-

[1] *i. e.* these corporations being fraternities in evil. *Hujusmodi municipiis et collegiis nil aliud existentibus quam fraternitatibus in malo.* See 19 H. 7. c. 7.

[2] *i. e.* the *object* of the law was to bring silver to the mint; its *enactment* was that clipped coins should not be current. *Hoc revera agebat, ut,* &c. *Ordinabat autem ut,* &c. See 19 H. 7. c. 5.

[3] *Ne grani quidem factâ gratiâ, quam remedium vocant.*

[4] *Adeo ut per consequentiam omnes nummos argenteos in monetariam regis, iterum recudendos, adduci necesse fuerit; unde rex propter novam cusionem fructum perciperet.*

[5] The translation has *Carceres superoneraret.*

houses; as strings of one root together, and as if the one were unprofitable without the other.[1]

As for riots and retainers, there passed scarce any Parliament in this time without a law against them: the King ever having an eye to might and multitude.[2]

There was granted also that Parliament a subsidy,[3] both from[4] the temporalty and the clergy. And yet nevertheless ere the year expired there went out commissions for a general benevolence;[5] though there were no wars; no fears. The same year the City gave five thousand marks, for confirmation of their liberties; a thing fitter for the beginnings of kings' reigns than the latter ends. Neither was it a small matter that the mint gained upon the late statute, by the recoinage of groats and half-groats; now twelve-pences and six-pences. As for Empson and Dudley's

[1] *i. e.* as if the punishment of the one were unprofitable without the putting down of the others. The translation has, more correctly, *atque ac si alterum absque cæteris extingui posse vana opinio esset.* The statute in question is 19 H. 7. c. 12.

[2] *Magnatum potentiam et populares cœtus.* See 19 H. 7. c. 13, 14.

[3] The King had at this time a claim by law upon his subjects for "two reasonable aids;" one for the knighting of his son, the other for the marriage of his daughter. The Commons offered him 40,000*l.* in lieu of the said two aids. See Statutes of the Realm, p. 675.

The old Chronicle says that there was granted to the King at this Parliament an aid of 36,000*l.*

Modern historians state, I do not know on what authority, that the King was content with 30,000*l.*

[4] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "for."

[5] This is stated by Holinshed; and in the book of the King's payments (Chapter House Records: A. 5. 18.) there are several items dated in the 21st of Henry VII. relating to the "arrears of the Benevolence," which seem to confirm the statement. It appears however from the Calendar of Patent Rolls (21 Hen. VII. pt. 1. p. 51.) that they were the arrears of the former Benevolence, made leviable by Parliament 11 Hen. VII. c. 10. I suspect therefore that this is a mistake.

id grind more than ever. So that it was ing to see what golden showers poured n m the King's treasury at once. The last payments of the marriage-money from Spain. The subsidy. The benevolence. The recoinage. The redemption of the city's liberties. The casualties.[1] And this is the more to be marvelled at, because the King had then no occasions at all of wars or troubles He had now but one son; and one daughter unbestowed. He was wise. He was of an high mind. He needed not to make riches his glory,[2] he did excel in so many things else; save that certainly avarice doth ever find in itself matter of ambition. Belike he thought[3] to leave his son such a kingdom and such a mass of treasure, as he might choose his greatness where he would.

This year was also kept the Serjeants' feast,[4] which was the second call in this King's days.

About this time[5] Isabella Queen of Castile deceased; a right noble lady, and an honour to her sex and times; and the corner-stone of the greatness of Spain that hath followed. This accident the King took not for news at large, but thought it had a great relation to his own affairs; especially in two points: the one for example, the other for consequence. First he con-

[1] *Casualia undique emergentia.*

[2] Ed. 1622 has a full stop after "glory;" which is clearly wrong. The MS. has only a comma; and the translation has *cum aliis rebus plurimis . . . . eniteret.*

[3] *Forsitan amor filii hanc cogitationem animo suo suggessit, se tam potens regnum, &c.*

[4] On the 13th of November, 1503, according to the old Chronicle, fo. 206.

[5] He should have said in the beginning of the next year, which was the 20th of the King. Queen Isabella died on the 26th of November, 1504.

[6] Prescott's History of Ferdinand and Isabella.

ceived that the case of Ferdinando of Arragon after the death of Queen Isabella, was his own case after the death of his own Queen; and the case of Joan the heir unto Castile, was the case of his own son Prince Henry. For if both of the Kings had their kingdoms in the right of their wives, they descended to the heirs and did not accrue to the husbands. And although his own case had both steel and parchment more than the other;[1] that is to say, a conquest in the field and an act of Parliament; yet notwithstanding that natural title of descent in blood did (in the imagination even of a wise man) breed a doubt that the other two were not safe nor sufficient. Wherefore he was wonderful diligent to inquire and observe what became of the King of Arragon in holding and continuing the kingdom of Castile; and whether he did hold it in his own right, or as administrator to his daughter; and whether he were like to hold it in fact, or to be put out by his son-in-law.[2] Secondly, he did revolve in his mind, that the state of Christendom might by this late accident have a turn. For whereas before time himself with the conjunction of Arragon and Castile (which then was one), and the amity of Maximilian and Philip his son the Archduke, was far too strong a party for France; he began to fear that now the French King (who had great interest in the affections of Philip the young King of Castile), and Philip himself now King of Castile (who was in ill terms with his father-in-law about the present government

[1] *Ille Ferdinandi.*

[2] This latter clause "and whether he were like," &c. is omitted in the translation. The previous one is worded rather more accurately thus — *Atque insuper, si forte retinuisset, utrum in jure proprio vel ut administrator bonorum filiæ suæ se illud tenere profiteretur.*

of Castile), and thirdly Maximilian, Philip's father, (who was ever variable, and upon whom the surest aim that could be taken was that he would not be long as he had been last before), would all three being potent Princes, enter into some strait league and confederation amongst themselves, whereby though he should not be endangered, yet he should be left to the poor amity of Arragon; and whereas he had been heretofore a kind of arbiter of Europe, he should now go less, and be over-topped by so great a conjunction. He had also (as it seems) an inclination to marry, and bethought himself of some fit conditions abroad.[1] And amongst others he had heard of the beauty and virtuous behaviour[2] of the young Queen of Naples, the widow of Ferdinando the younger, being then of matronal years of seven and twenty: by whose marriage he thought that the kingdom of Naples, having been a goal[3] for a time between the King of Arragon and the French King, and being but newly settled, might in some part be deposited in his hands, who was so able to keep the stakes. Therefore he sent in ambassage or message three confident persons, Francis Marsin, James Braybrooke, and John Stile, upon two several inquisitions, rather than negotiations:[4] the one

[1] *Et circumspicere quales conditiones matrimoniorum in Europa tunc se ostenderent.*

[2] *Moribus suavissimis.*

[3] This word seems to be used here merely for a subject of contention. The translation has *de quo . . . certatum fuerat.*

[4] A copy of the several articles, with the answers, is still extant in the Cotton collection. The part which relates to the Queen of Naples is in Vitel. C. xi. fo. 34. The part which relates to Ferdinand in Vesp. C. vi. fo. 338. The commissioners went first to Valencia where the two Queens were; and then to Segovia where they arrived on the 14th of July, 1505, and had their interview with Ferdinand two or three days after.

An entry in a book of accompts of Henry VII., now in the British Mu-

touching the person and condition of the young Queen of Naples: the other touching all particulars of estate that concerned the fortunes and intentions of Ferdinando. And because they may observe best who themselves are observed least, he sent them under colourable pretexts; giving them letters of kindness and compliment from Katherine the Princess to her aunt and niece, the old and young Queen of Naples; and delivering to them also a book of new articles of peace; which notwithstanding it had been delivered unto Doctor de Puebla, the lieger ambassador of Spain here in England, to be sent; yet for that the King had been long without hearing from Spain, he thought good those messengers, when they had been with the two Queens, should likewise pass on to the court of Ferdinando, and take a copy of the book with them. The instructions touching the Queen of Naples were so curious and exquisite, being as articles whereby to direct a survey or framing a particular of her person,[1] for complexion, favour, feature,[2] stature, health, age, customs, behaviour, conditions, and estate; as, if the

seum (Additional MSS. 21,480), gives the date of their departure, and is worth inserting as a record of the terms upon which such services were paid. Among the payments of the 1st and 2nd of May, in the 20th year of Henry's reign, I find—

"*Item* to James Braybrooke going upon the King's message for four months at 5*s*. the day . . . . . 28*l*.
"*Item* to Fraunces Marsen for his costs at 5*s*. the day in likewise . 28*l*.
"*Item* for John Style his costs at 4*s*. the day . . . . . 22*l*. 8*s*."

[1] *Cum articulos continerent adeo præcisos ut veluti tabulam aliquam conficerent personæ ejus.*

[2] *Aspectum, lineamenta corporis.* In the original instructions, one of the things which the commissioners are directed "specially to mark and note well" is "the feature of her body;" upon which they report that they can give no answers to that point because the young Queen was so covered with her mantle that they could *only see her visage.*

een young, a man would have judged him
is; but being ancient, it ought to be inter-
sure he was very chaste, for that he meant
hings in one woman, and so to settle his
without ranging. But in this match he was
, when he heard from his ambassadors that
young Queen had had a goodly jointure in the
m of Naples, well answered during the time of
uncle Frederick, yea and during the time of Lewis
French King, in whose division her revenue fell;
since the time that the kingdom was in Ferdi-
do's hands, all was assigned to the army and gar-
ons there; and she received only a pension or
ibition out of his coffers.

The other part of the inquiry had a grave and dili-
nt return; informing the King at full of the present
te of King Ferdinando. By this report it appeared
to the King that Ferdinando did continue the govern-
ment of Castile as administrator unto his daughter
Joan, by the title of Queen Isabella's will, and partly
by the custom of the kingdom (as he pretended); and
that all mandates and grants were expedited in the
name of Joan his daughter and himself as adminis-
trator, without mention of Philip her husband. And
that King Ferdinando, howsoever he did dismiss him-
self of the name of King of Castile, yet meant to hold
the kingdom without account and in absolute com-
mand.

It appeareth also that he flattered himself with hopes
that King Philip would permit unto him the govern-
ment of Castile during his life; which he had laid his
plot to work him unto,[1] both by some counsellors of

[1] *Quod Ferdinandus certe ei persuadere vehementer conatus est.*

his about him which Ferdinando had at his devotion, and chiefly by promise[1] that in case Philip gave not way unto it he would marry some young lady, whereby to put him by the succession of Arragon and Granada, in case he should have a son; and lastly by representing unto him that the government of the Burgundians, till Philip were by continuance in Spain made as natural of Spain, would not be endured by the Spaniards. But in all those things, though wisely laid down and considered, Ferdinando failed; but that Pluto was better to him than Pallas.

In the same report also the ambassadors, being mean men and therefore the more free, did strike upon a string which was somewhat dangerous; for they declared plainly that the people of Spain both nobles and commons were better affected unto the part of Philip (so he brought his wife with him) than to Ferdinando; and expressed the reason to be, because he had imposed upon them many taxes and tallages; which was the King's own case between him and his son.[2]

There was also in this report a declaration of an overture of marriage, which Amason the secretary of Ferdinando had made unto the ambassadors in great secret, between Charles Prince of Castile and Mary the King's second daughter; assuring the King that the treaty of marriage then on foot for the said Prince and the daughter of France would break; and that she the said daughter of France should be married to Angolesme, that was the heir apparent of France.

[1] *Protestatione.*

[2] *Quæ certe, simul representata, ipsissimum casum exprimebant inter regem et filium suum.*

There was a touch also of a speech of marriage between Ferdinando and Madame de Fois, a lady of the blood of France, which afterwards indeed succeeded. But this was reported as learnt in France, and silenced in Spain.[1]

The King by the return of this ambassage, which gave great light unto his affairs, was well instructed and prepared how to carry himself between Ferdinando King of Arragon and Philip his son-in-law King of Castile; resolving with himself to do all that in him lay to keep them at one within themselves; but howsoever that succeeded, by a moderate carriage and bearing the person of a common friend to lose neither of their friendships; but yet to run a course more entire with the King of Arragon, but more laboured and officious with the King of Castile.[2] But he was much taken with the overture of marriage with his daughter Mary; both because it was the greatest marriage of Christendom, and for that it took hold of both allies. But to corroborate his alliance with Philip, the winds gave him an interview. For Philip choosing the winter season the better to surprise the King of Arragon, set forth with a great navy out of Flanders for Spain in the month of January, the one and twentieth year of the King's reign. But himself was surprised with a cruel tempest, that scattered his ships upon the several coasts of England; and the ship wherein the King and Queen were, with two other small barks only, torn

[1] *Tamquam rem quam in Gallia perdidicerant, in Hispania autem silentio cohibitam.* "Silenced" seems to mean merely not talked of.

[2] *Ita tamen ut interiore affectu Ferdinandi rebus faveret, externis vero demonstrationibus et officiis Philippum magis demereretur.*

and in great peril, to escape the fury of the weather thrust into Weymouth. King Philip himself, having not been used as it seems to sea, all wearied and extreme sick, would needs land to refresh his spirits; though it was against the opinion of his counsel, doubting it might breed delay, his occasions requiring celerity.

The rumour of the arrival of a puissant navy upon the coast made the country arm. And Sir Thomas Trenchard, with forces suddenly raised, not knowing what the matter might be, came to Weymouth: where understanding the accident, he did in all humbleness and humanity invite the King and Queen to his house; and forthwith dispatched posts to the court. Soon after came Sir John Caroe[1] likewise with a great troop of men well armed, using the like humbleness and respects towards the King, when he knew the case. King Philip doubting that they, being but subjects, durst not let him pass away again without the King's notice and leave, yielded to their intreaties to stay till they heard from the court. The King, as soon as he heard the news, commanded presently the Earl of Arundel to go to visit the King of Castile, and to let him[2] understand that as he was very sorry for his mishap, so he was glad that he had escaped the danger of the seas, and likewise of the occasion himself had to do him honour; and desiring him to think himself as in his own land; and that the King made all haste possible to come and embrace him. The Earl came to him in great magnificence with a brave troop of three hundred horse; and for more state came by torch-light.

[1] So spelt both in MS. and Ed. 1622.
[2] So MS. Ed. 1622 has "and let him."

After he had done the King's message, King Philip seeing how the world went,[1] the sooner to get away, went upon speed to the King at Windsor, and his Queen followed by easy journeys. The two Kings at their meeting used all the caresses and loving demonstrations that were possible. And the King of Castile said pleasantly to the King, that he was now punished for that he would not come within his walled town of Calais, when they met last. But the King answered, that walls and seas were nothing where hearts were open; and that he was here no otherwise but to be served. After a day or two's refreshing, the Kings entered into speech of renewing the treaty; the King saying that though King Philip's person were the same, yet his fortunes and state were raised; in which case a renovation of treaty was used amongst Princes. But while these things were in handling, the King choosing a fit time, and drawing the King of Castile into a room where they two only were private, and laying his hand civilly upon his arm, and changing his countenance a little from a countenance of entertainment,[2] said to him, Sir, you have been saved upon my coast, I hope you will not suffer me to wreck upon yours. The King of Castile asked him what he meant by that speech? I mean it (saith the King) by that same harebrain wild fellow my subject the Earl of Suffolk, who is protected in your country, and begins to play the fool, when all others are weary of it. The King of Castile answered, I had thought, Sir, your felicity had been above those thoughts. But if it trouble you, I will banish him. The King replied,

[1] *Regis animum satis perspiciens.*
[2] *Vultuque nonnihil ad serium composito.*

those hornets were best in their nest, and worst then when they did fly abroad; and that his desire was to have him delivered to him. The King of Castile herewith a little confused, and in a study, said, That can I not do with my honour, and less with yours; for you will be thought to have used me as a prisoner. The King presently said, Then the matter is at an end. For I will take that dishonour upon me, and so your honour is saved. The King of Castile, who had the King in great estimation, and besides remembered where he was, and knew not what use he might have of the King's amity; for that himself was new in his state of Spain, and unsettled both with his father-in-law and with his people; composing his countenance, said, Sir, you give law to me; but so will I to you. You shall have him, but upon your honour you shall not take his life. The King embracing him said, Agreed. Saith the King of Castile, Neither shall it dislike you, if I send to him in such a fashion as he may partly come with his own good will. The King said it was well thought of; and if it pleased him he would join with him in sending to the Earl a message to that purpose. They both sent severally; and mean while they continued feasting and pastimes; the King being on his part willing to have the Earl sure before the King of Castile went; and the King of Castile being as willing to seem to be enforced.[1] The King also with many wise and excellent persuasions did advise the King of Castile to be ruled by the counsel of his father-in-law Ferdinando; a Prince so prudent, so experienced, so fortunate. The King of Castile (who was in no very good terms with his said father-in-law) answered, that

[1] *In hoc conveniente, ut res manifestius a se extorta putaretur.*

if his father-in-law would suffer him to govern his kingdoms, he should govern him.

There were immediately messengers sent from both Kings to recall the Earl of Suffolk; who upon gentle words used to him was soon charmed, and willing enough to return; assured of his life, and hoping of his liberty. He was brought through Flanders to Calais, and thence landed at Dover, and with sufficient guard delivered and received at the Tower of London.[1] Meanwhile King Henry to draw out the time, continued his feastings and entertainments, and after he had[2] received the King of Castile into the fraternity of the Garter, and for a reciprocal had his son the Prince admitted to the order of the Golden Fleece, he accompanied King Philip and his Queen to the City of London; where they were entertained with the greatest magnificence and triumph that could be upon no greater warning. And as soon as the Earl of Suffolk had been conveyed to the Tower (which was the serious part) the jollities had an end, and the Kings took leave. Nevertheless during their being here, they in substance concluded that treaty which the Flemings term *intercursus malus*, and bears date at Windsor: for there be some things in it more to the advantage of the English than of them; especially for that the free fishing of the Dutch upon the coasts and seas of England, granted in the treaty of *undecimo*, was not by this treaty confirmed; all articles that confirm former treaties being precisely and warily

[1] About the end of March, 1505–6, according to the old Chronicle, fo. 207.

[2] All this from "to draw out" to "after he had," is omitted in the translation.

limited and confined to matter of commerce only, and not otherwise.

It was observed that the great tempest which drave Philip into England blew down the golden eagle from the spire of Paul's, and in the fall it fell upon a sign of the black eagle which was in Paul's church-yard in the place where the school-house now standeth,[1] and battered it and broke it down; which was a strange stooping of a hawk upon a fowl. This the people interpreted to be an ominous prognostic upon the imperial house; which was by interpretation also fulfilled upon Philip the Emperor's son; not only in the present disaster of the tempest, but in that that followed. For Philip arriving into Spain and attaining the possession of the kingdom of Castile without resistance, insomuch as Ferdinando who had spoke so great before was with difficulty admitted to the speech of his son-in-law, sickened soon after, and deceased: yet after such time as there was an observation by the wisest of that court, that if he had lived his father would have gained upon him in that sort, as he would have governed his counsels and designs, if not his affections. By this all Spain returned into the power of Ferdinando in state as it was before; the rather in regard of the infirmity of Joan his daughter, who loving her husband (by whom she had many children) dearly well, and no less beloved of him (howsoever her father to make Philip ill-beloved of the people of Spain gave out that Philip used her not well), was unable in strength of mind to bear the grief of his decease, and fell distracted of her wits:[2] of which malady

[1] The words "in the place where," &c. are omitted in the translation.
[2] She is said to have exhibited decided symptoms of insanity before.

ıs thought no ways to endeavour the cure, hold his regal power in Castile. So that ne y of Charles the Eighth was said to be a , so t ıe adversity of Ferdinando was said like- ɜ to be a dream, it passed over so soon.

About this time the King was desirous to bring into house of Lancaster celestial honour; and became ɔr to Pope Julius to canonise King Henry the h for a saint; the rather in respect of that his ıs prediction of the King's own assumption to the vn. Julius referred the matter (as the manner is) certain cardinals to take the verification of his holy ɜ and miracles: but it died under the reference. general opinion was, that Pope Julius was too , and that the King would not come to his rates. it is more probable, that that Pope, who was ex-

Modern historians, deriving their information from the Spanish writers, represent Philip as having really used her ill. But this does not appear to have been the impression of the Venetian ambassador Vincenzo Quirini; whose "relazione" (written shortly after Philip's death) contains an account of the relation between them, which agrees very well with what Bacon says. After giving a very favourable character of Philip, the ambassador proceeds: — "A questo principe così grande e nobile, e così virtuoso, fu data per moglie una donna gelosa (ancora che assai bella e nobilissima e di tanti regni erede) la quale con la sua gelosia molestava in tal modo il marito, che il povero ed infelice non si poteva in tutti di lei contentare; perchè la non parlava con molte persone, nè accarezzava alcuno; stava sempre ristretta in camera e consumavasi de se stessa per gelosia; amava la solitudine, fuggiva feste, solazzi, e piaceri, e sopra tutto non voleva compagnia di donne, nè fiamminghe, nè spagnuole, nè vecchie, nè giovani, nè di qualunque altro grado. È però donna di buon ingegno, e apprenda comodamente quello che le vien detto, e le poche parole ch' ella risponde le parla con buona maniera e con buona forma, servando quella gravità che a regina si conviene; il che potei comprendere quando per nome della serenità vostra le feci riverenza, ed esposi brevemente quello che in commissione avevo." *Alberi, Ser.* 1. vol. i. p. 5, 6.

If this be true, it is easy to believe both in her affection for Philip during his life and in her distraction at his death; and also that two very different stories might be told with regard to his treatment of her.

tremely jealous of the dignity of the see of Rome and of the acts thereof, knowing that King Henry Sixth was reputed in the world abroad but for a simple man, was afraid it would but diminish the estimation of that kind of honour, if there were not a distance kept between innocents and saints.

The same year likewise there proceeded a treaty of marriage between the King and the Lady Margaret Duchess Dowager of Savoy, only daughter to Maximilian and sister to the King of Castile; a lady wise and of great good fame. This matter had been in speech between the two Kings at their meeting; but was soon after resumed; and therein was employed for his first piece the King's then chaplain, and after the great prelate, Thomas Wolsey.[1] It was in the end concluded with great and ample conditions for the King, but with promise *de futuro* only. It may be the King was the rather induced unto it, for that he had heard more and more of the marriage to go on between his great friend and ally Ferdinando of Arragon and Madame de Fois; whereby that King began to piece with the French King, from whom he had been always before severed. So fatal a thing it is for the greatest and straitest amities of Kings at one time or other to have a little of the wheel. Nay there is a further tradition (in Spain though not with us) that the King of Arragon (after he knew that the marriage

[1] It seems that Wolsey was employed in the negotiation of this marriage as early as Nov. 1504. See Cott. Galba B. ii. fo. 128. But the date is only in the margin.

That volume consists of original instructions, &c. from Hen. VII. but has been so damaged by fire that one can only make out the general subject. There is not a leaf of which the edges have not been burned away. The articles are in Vitel. C. xi. fo. 127.

between Charles the young Prince of Castile and Mary the King's second daughter went roundly on, which though it was first moved by the King of Arragon, yet it was afterwards wholly advanced and brought to perfection by Maximilian and the friends on that side) entered into a jealousy that the King did aspire to the government of Castilia,[1] as administrator during the minority of his son-in-law; as if there should have been a competition of three for that government; Ferdinando grandfather on the mother's side; Maximilian grandfather on the father's side; and King Henry father-in-law to the young Prince. Certainly it is not unlike but the King's government (carrying the young Prince with him) would have been perhaps more welcome to the Spaniards than that of the other two. For the nobility of Castilia, that so lately put out the King of Arragon in favour of King Philip, and had discovered themselves so far, could not be but in a secret distrust and distaste of that King. And as for Maximilian, upon twenty respects he could not have been the man. But this purpose of the King's seemeth to me (considering the King's safe courses,[2] never found to be enterprising or adventurous,) not greatly probable; except he should have had a desire to breathe warmer, because he had ill lungs.

This marriage with Margaret was protracted from

[1] Dr. Lingard (quoting Zurita, vi. 163.) says that after the death of Philip, Maximilian urged Henry to make this claim.

The following entry in the Calendar of Patent Rolls (22 Hen. VII. pt. 3. p. 20.) may be quoted as bearing indirectly upon this point.

"14 June. License (*at the request of Margaret Duchess Dowager of Savoy*, John Sheldon Governor, and merchants adventurers) to the said Governor and merchants to resort to and freely trade in Holland, Zealand, Brabant, and Flanders, *and other countries under the rule of Castile.*"

[2] *Regis mores reputantibus et consilia tuta et solida.*

time to time, in respect of the infirmity of the King,[1] who now in the two and twentieth of his reign began to be troubled with the gout: but the defluxion taking also into his breast, wasted his lungs, so that thrice in a year in a kind of return, and especially in the spring, he had great fits and labours of the tissick.[2] Nevertheless he continued to intend business with as great diligence as before in his health: yet so, as upon this warning he did likewise now more seriously think of the world to come; and of making himself a saint, as well as King Henry the Sixth, by treasure better employed than to be given to Pope Julius. For this year he gave greater alms than accustomed, and discharged all prisoners about the City that lay for fees, or debts under forty shillings. He did also make haste with religious foundations. And in the year following, which was the three and twentieth, finished that of the Savoy. And hearing also of the bitter cries of his people against the oppressions of Dudley and Empson and their complices, partly by devout persons about him and partly by public sermons (the preachers doing their duty therein), he was touched with great remorse for the same. Nevertheless Empson and Dudley

[1] Dr. Lingard, who has had recourse to Spanish historians and archives, gives a different explanation of the breaking off of this treaty: viz. that upon the death of Philip (25 Sep. 1506) Henry conceived the idea of marrying his widow Juana Queen of Castile; which he only abandoned on being satisfied that her insanity was permanent and incurable.

It seems however that the marriage with Margaret was still in consideration in September, 1507, and that Maximilian was still in hope of its proceeding, and that Margaret herself had some objections from an apprehension that it would imprison her in England. The difficulty of agreeing upon the conditions in this respect would account sufficiently for its not being concluded. See Corr. de Maximilian I. et de Marguerite d'Autriche, 1. p. 11. Margaret assumed the government of the Low Countries in the beginning of 1507.

[2] *i. e.* phthisis.

hen come to eighteen years of age, and being a d Prince and liberal, and that gained upon the people by his very aspect and presence[1]) had not been impossible to have comen upon him.

To crown also the last year of his reign as well as his first, he did an act of piety, rare and worthy to be taken in imitation. For he granted forth a general pardon;[2] as expecting a second coronation in a better kingdom. He did also declare in his will, that his mind was, that restitution should be made of those sums which had been unjustly taken by his officers.

And thus this Salomon of England (for Salomon also was too heavy upon his people in exactions) having lived two and fifty years, and thereof reigned three and twenty years and eight months, being in perfect memory and in a most blessed mind, in a great calm of a consuming sickness, passed to a better world, the two and twentieth of April 1508,[3] at his palace of Richmond which himself had built.

This King[4] (to speak of him in terms equal to his deserving) was one of the best sort of wonders; a

two. Vincenzo Quirini, writing in 1506, describes Henry as "uomo di anni cinquanta quattro, assai ben disposto della persona, savio, prudente, *non odiato nè eziam molto amato dalli suoi popoli.*" *Alberi, Ser.* 1. vol. i. p. 19.

[1] *Oris majestate.*

[2] *Qualis in coronatione regum concedi solet.*

[3] This is a mistake; occasioned apparently by a misprint in Speed. Henry completed his 23rd year on the 21st of August, 1508, and died on the 22nd of April, 1509.

[4] In the character of Henry which follows and concludes the work the differences between the Latin translation and the English original are unusually numerous. There is nothing added indeed, nor is the meaning in any place materially modified. But the expression is so frequently varied that it would seem as if Bacon had done this part of the translation himself and with care. I have thought it better therefore to print it entire. It will be found in the appendix, No. III.

wonder for wise men. He had parts (both in his virtues and his fortune) not so fit for a common-place as for observation. Certainly he was religious, both in his affection and observance. But as he could see clear (for those times) through superstition; so he would be blinded now and then by human policy. He advanced church-men. He was tender in the privilege of sanctuaries, though they wrought him much mischief. He built and endowed many religious foundations, besides his memorable hospital of the Savoy: and yet was he a great alms-giver in secret; which shewed that his works in public were dedicated rather to God's glory than his own. He professed always to love and seek peace; and it was his usual preface in his treaties,[1] that when Christ came into the world peace was sung, and when he went out of the world peace was bequeathed. And this virtue could not proceed out of fear or softness, for he was valiant and active; and therefore no doubt it was truly Christian and moral. Yet he knew the way to peace was not to seem to be desirous to avoid wars. Therefore would he make offers and fames of wars, till he had mended the conditions of peace. It was also much, that one that was so great a lover of peace should be so happy in war. For his arms, either in foreign or civil wars, were never infortunate; neither did he know what a disaster meant. The war of his coming in, and the rebellions of the Earl of Lincoln and the Lord Audley, were ended by victory. The wars of France and Scotland by peaces sought at his hands. That of

[1] This statement is not strictly borne out by those of his treaties which are printed in Rymer. It is true however that most of them contain some preamble about the blessings of peace. The particular expression quoted by Bacon occurs I think in one of the Bulls of dispensation.

[illegible] ne accident of the Duke's death.[1] The in- s [illegible] the Lord Lovell, and that of Perkin at [illegible] n Kent, by flight of the rebels before they [illegible]e to blows. So that his fortune of arms was still inviolate. The rather sure, for that in the quenching of the commotions of his subjects he ever went in person: sometimes reserving himself to back and second his lieutenants, but ever in action. And yet that was not merely forwardness, but partly distrust of others.

He did much maintain and countenance his laws; which (nevertheless) was no impediment to him to work his will. For it was so handled that neither prerogative nor profit went to diminution. And yet as he would sometimes strain up his laws to his prerogative, so would he also let down his prerogative to his Parliament. For mint and wars and martial discipline (things of absolute power) he would nevertheless bring to Parliament. Justice was well administered in his time, save where the King was party; save also that the counsel-table intermeddled too much with *meum* and *tuum*. For it was a very court of justice during his time; especially in the beginning. But in that part both of justice and policy which is the durable part, and cut as it were in brass or marble, which is the making of good laws, he did excel. And with his justice

[1] The war of Brittany, had Bacon's account of it been accurate, must have been accounted an exception to Henry's usual fortune in war. It might be an accident, but still it was a failure. But if we substitute the true history of it, which I have given in my note p. 154, we may fairly count it among the examples of his habitual success. The army accomplished all it was sent to accomplish; the ultimate frustration of Henry's object was due to an error of policy, not to an accident of war.

I may take this opportunity of correcting the statement in note 3. p. 97. as to the spelling of the name *Brittaine*. It is so spelt in the MS. in that place and one or two others immediately following. But afterwards it is always, or almost always, spelt *Britaine*.

he was also a merciful prince: as in whose time there were but three of the nobility that suffered; the Earl of Warwick; the Lord Chamberlain; and the Lord Audley: though the first two were instead of numbers in the dislike and obloquy of the people. But there were never so great rebellions expiated with so little blood drawn by the hand of justice, as the two rebellions of Blackheath and Exeter. As for the severity used upon those which were taken in Kent, it was but upon a scum of people. His pardons went ever both before and after his sword. But then he had withal a strange kind of interchanging of large and inexpected pardons with severe executions: which (his wisdom considered) could not be imputed to any inconstancy or inequality; but either to some reason which we do not now know, or to a principle he had set unto himself, that he would vary, and try both ways in turn. But the less blood he drew the more he took of treasure: and as some construed it, he was the more sparing in the one that he might be the more pressing in the other; for both would have been intolerable. Of nature assuredly he coveted to accumulate treasure; and was a little poor in admiring riches. The people (into whom there is infused for the preservation of monarchies a natural desire to discharge their princes, though it be with the unjust charge of their counsellors and ministers) did impute this unto Cardinal Morton and Sir Reignold Bray; who as it after appeared (as counsellors of ancient authority with him) did so second his humours, as nevertheless they did temper them. Whereas Empson and Dudley that followed, being persons that had no reputation with him otherwise than by the servile following of his bent, did not

give way only (as the first did) but shape him way to those extremities, for which himself was touched with remorse at his death; and which his successor renounced, and sought to purge. This excess of his had at that time many glosses and interpretations. Some thought the continual rebellions wherewith he had been vexed had made him grow to hate his people: Some thought it was done to pull down their stomachs and to keep them low: Some, for that he would leave his son a golden fleece: Some suspected he had some high design upon foreign parts. But those perhaps shall come nearest the truth that fetch not their reasons so far off; but rather impute it to nature, age, peace, and a mind fixed upon no other ambition or pursuit: whereunto I should add, that having every day occasion to take notice of the necessities and shifts for money of other great Princes abroad, it did the better by comparison set off to him the felicity of full coffers. As to his expending of treasure, he never spared charge which his affairs required: and in his buildings was magnificent; but his rewards were very limited. So that his liberality was rather upon his own state and memory than upon the deserts of others. He was of an high mind, and loved his own will and his own way; as one that revered himself, and would reign indeed. Had he been a private man he would have been termed proud: but in a wise Prince, it was but keeping of distance; which indeed he did towards all; not admitting any near or full approach either to his power or to his secrets. For he was governed by none. His Queen (notwithstanding she had presented him with divers children; and with a crown also, though he would not acknowledge it)

could do nothing with him. His mother he reverenced much, heard little. For any person agreeable to him for society (such as was Hastings to King Edward the Fourth, or Charles Brandon after to King Henry the Eighth), he had none; except we should account for such persons Foxe and Bray and Empson, because they were so much with him. But it was but as the instrument is much with the workman. He had nothing in him of vain-glory, but yet kept state and majesty to the height; being sensible that majesty maketh the people bow, but vain-glory boweth to them.

To his confederates abroad he was constant and just; but not open. But rather such was his inquiry and such his closeness, as they stood in the light towards him, and he stood in the dark to them; yet without strangeness, but with a semblance of mutual communication of affairs. As for little envies or emulations upon foreign princes (which are frequent with many Kings), he had never any; but went substantially to his own business. Certain it is, that though his reputation was great at home, yet it was greater abroad. For foreigners that could not see the passages of affairs, but made their judgments upon the issues of them, noted that he was ever in strife and ever aloft. It grew also from the airs which the princes and states abroad received from their ambassadors and agents here; which were attending the court in great number; whom he did not only content with courtesy, reward, and privateness; but (upon such conferences as passed with them) put them in admiration to find his universal insight into the affairs of the world: which though he did suck chiefly from themselves, yet that which he had gathered from them all seemed ad-

mirable to every one. So that they did write ever to their superiors in high terms concerning his wisdom and art of rule. Nay when they were returned, they did commonly maintain intelligence with him; such a dexterity he had to impropriate to himself all foreign instruments.

He was careful and liberal to obtain good intelligence from all parts abroad; wherein he did not only use his interest in the liegers here, and his pensioners which he had both in the court of Rome and other the courts of Christendom, but the industry and vigilancy of his own ambassadors in foreign parts. For which purpose his instructions were ever extreme curious and articulate; and in them more articles touching inquisition than touching negotiation: requiring likewise from his ambassadors an answer, in particular distinct articles, respectively to his questions.

As for his secret spials which he did employ both at home and abroad, by them to discover what practices and conspiracies were against him; surely his case required it; he had such moles perpetually working and casting to undermine him. Neither can it be reprehended; for if spials be lawful against lawful enemies, much more against conspirators and traitors. But indeed to give them credence by oaths or curses, that cannot be well maintained; for these are too holy vestments for a disguise. Yet surely there was this further good in his employing of those flies and familiars; that as the use of them was cause that many conspiracies were revealed, so the fame and suspicion of them kept (no doubt) many conspiracies from being attempted.

Towards his Queen he was nothing uxorious; nor

scarce indulgent; but companiable and respective, and without jealousy. Towards his children he was full of paternal affection, careful of their education, aspiring to their high advancement, regular to see that they should not want of any due honour and respect; but not greatly willing to cast any popular lustre upon them.

To his counsel he did refer much, and sat oft in person; knowing it to be the way to assist his power and inform his judgment: in which respect also he was fairly patient of liberty both of advice and of vote, till himself were declared.

He kept a strait hand on his nobility, and chose rather to advance clergymen and lawyers, which were more obsequious to him, but had less interest in the people; which made for his absoluteness, but not for his safety. Insomuch as I am persuaded it was one of the causes of his troublesome reign. For that his nobles, though they were loyal and obedient, yet did not cooperate with him, but let every man go his own way. He was not afraid of an able man, as Lewis the Eleventh was. But contrariwise he was served by the ablest men that then were to be found; without which his affairs could not have prospered as they did. For war, Bedford, Oxford, Surrey, Dawbeny, Brooke, Poynings. For other affairs, Morton, Foxe, Bray, the Prior of Lanthony, Warham, Urswick, Hussey, Frowick, and others. Neither did he care how cunning they were that he did employ: for he thought himself to have the master-reach. And as he chose well, so he held them up well. For it is a strange thing, that though he were a dark prince, and infinitely suspicious, and his times full of secret conspiracies and troubles; yet in twenty-four years reign he never put down or

discomposed counsellor or near servant, save only Stanley the Lord Chamberlain. As for the disposition of his subjects in general towards him, it stood thus with him; that of the three affections which naturally tie the hearts of the subjects to their sovereign, — love, fear, and reverence, — he had the last in height; the second in good measure; and so little of the first, as he was beholding to the other two.

He was a Prince, sad, serious, and full of thoughts and secret observations; and full of notes and memorials of his own hand, especially touching persons; as whom[1] to employ, whom to reward, whom to inquire of, whom to beware of, what were the dependencies, what were the factions, and the like; keeping (as it were) a journal of his thoughts. There is to this day a merry tale; that his monkey (set on as it was thought by one of his chamber) tore his principal note-book all to pieces, when by chance it lay forth: whereat the court which liked not those pensive accounts was almost tickled with sport.

He was indeed full of apprehensions and suspicions. But as he did easily take them, so he did easily check them and master them; whereby they were not dangerous, but troubled himself more than others. It is true, his thoughts were so many, as they could not well always stand together; but that which did good one way, did hurt another. Neither did he at some times weigh them aright in their proportions. Certainly that rumour which did him so much mischief (that the Duke of York should be saved and alive) was (at the first) of his own nourishing, because he would have more reason not to reign in the right of

[1] The rest of the MS. is lost.

his wife. He was affable, and both well and fair spoken; and would use strange sweetness and blandishments of words, where he desired to effect or persuade any thing that he took to heart. He was rather studious than learned; reading most books that were of any worth, in the French tongue. Yet he understood the Latin, as appeareth in that Cardinal Hadrian and others, who could very well have written French, did use to write to him in Latin.

For his pleasures, there is no news of them. And yet by his instructions to Marsin and Stile touching the Queen of Naples, it seemeth he could interrogate well touching beauty. He did by pleasures as great Princes do by banquets, come and look a little upon them, and turn way. For never Prince was more wholly given to his affairs, nor in them more of himself: insomuch as in triumphs of justs and tourneys and balls and masks (which they then called disguises) he was rather a princely and gentle spectator than seemed much to be delighted.

No doubt, in him as in all men (and most of all in Kings) his fortune wrought upon his nature, and his nature upon his fortune. He attained to the crown, not only from a private fortune, which might endow him with moderation; but also from the fortune of an exiled man, which had quickened in him all seeds of observation and industry. And his times being rather prosperous than calm, had raised his confidence by success, but almost marred his nature by troubles. His wisdom, by often evading from perils, was turned rather into a dexterity to deliver himself from dangers when they pressed him, than into a providence to prevent and remove them afar off. And even in nature,

the sight of his mind was like some sights of eyes; rather strong at hand than to carry afar off. For his wit increased upon the occasion; and so much the more if the occasion were sharpened by danger. Again, whether it were the shortness of his foresight, or the strength of his will, or the dazzling of his suspicions, or what it was; certain it is that the perpetual troubles of his fortunes (there being no more matter out of which they grew) could not have been without some great defects and main errors in his nature, customs, and proceedings, which he had enough to do to save and help with a thousand little industries and watches. But those do best appear in the story itself. Yet take him with all his defects, if a man should compare him with the Kings his concurrents in France and Spain, he shall find him more politic than Lewis the Twelfth of France, and more entire and sincere than Ferdinando of Spain. But if you shall change Lewis the Twelfth for Lewis the Eleventh, who lived a little before, then the consort is more perfect. For that Lewis the Eleventh, Ferdinando, and Henry, may be esteemed for the *tres magi* of kings of those ages. To conclude, if this King did no greater matters, it was long of himself; for what he minded he compassed.

He was a comely personage, a little above just stature, well and straight limbed, but slender. His countenance was reverend, and a little like a churchman: and as it was not strange or dark, so neither was it winning or pleasing, but as the face of one well disposed. But it was to the disadvantage of the painter, for it was best when he spake.

His worth may bear a tale or two, that may put upon him somewhat that may seem divine. When

the Lady Margaret his mother had divers great suitors for marriage, she dreamed one night that one in the likeness of a bishop in pontifical habit did tender her Edmund Earl of Richmond (the King's father) for her husband. Neither had she ever any child but the King, though she had three husbands. One day when King Henry the Sixth (whose innocency gave him holiness) was washing his hands at a great feast, and cast his eye upon King Henry, then a young youth, he said; "This is the lad that shall possess quietly that that we now strive for." But that that was truly divine in him, was that he had the fortune of a true Christian as well as of a great King, in living exercised and dying repentant. So as he had an happy warfare in both conflicts, both of sin and the cross.

He was born at Pembroke Castle, and lieth buried at Westminster, in one of the stateliest and daintiest monuments of Europe, both for the chapel and for the sepulchre. So that he dwelleth more richly dead, in the monument of his tomb, than he did alive in Richmond or any of his palaces. I could wish he did the like in this monument of his fame.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

GREAT COUNCILS.

THERE are three places in this history (see pp. 114. 176. 260.) in which I have ventured an opinion that what is called by our historians a *Parliament* was in reality a *Great Council.* The positive and particular grounds for the conjecture may be best understood in connexion with the narrative, and have therefore been explained in the several places. Certain general objections which may perhaps suggest themselves, will be answered more conveniently here.

It may be objected in the first place that the point being one of considerable constitutional importance, it is not likely that Bacon would have overlooked it. Polydore Vergil indeed, who was a foreigner; Hall, who merely followed Polydore, using no independent judgment of his own; Holinshed, who followed Hall; even Stowe and Speed, who though diligent and original explorers were not statesmen and constitutional lawyers; — all these might easily make the mistake and overlook the difficulties which it involves. But *Bacon's* acquiescence in such an error, if error it be, is not so easily accounted for. So familiar as he was with the practical working of government and the practical solution of state-problems; so inquisitive as he was into the particular ways and methods of Henry the Seventh, regarded as a study in

the art of government; so learned as he must have grown, by thirty years' service as a law officer of the Crown, and more than thirty as a member of Parliament, in constitutional precedents; so diligent and vigilant as he was in observing what he calls the "real passages" of affairs, — the real means by which ends were brought about; — it must be admitted that he was a man very unlikely to overlook the evidences of such a fact and quite certain not to overlook the importance of it. The adoption therefore by Bacon of Polydore Vergil's story, is a negative argument against my conjecture which it is necessary to remove.

But on referring to the particulars, it will be found that the direct evidence of the fact in each case is drawn almost entirely from sources which were not within Bacon's reach. At the time he wrote, there was no accessible collection of state-documents resembling Rymer's Fœdera, and apparently no accessible record by which it could be ascertained at what precise date the several Parliaments in this reign were called. The Herald's narrative, which supplies the only *positive* evidence we have as to the first of these Great Councils, it is clear that he had not seen. Henry the Seventh's privy-seal, which contains positive evidence as to the last, is a single sheet, which may not have been in Sir Robert Cotton's possession at the time, and if it was may easily have been overlooked; and without it, the notice in the old Chronicle, though distinct and of great weight, would have been hardly sufficient perhaps to establish the fact. Now if we should set aside all the evidence, direct or inferential, which is derived from these sources, there would really be no ground for suspecting the accuracy of Polydore's narrative. Therefore that Bacon did not anticipate the conjecture, is not in fact any presumption against it.

Another objection may be drawn from the silence of contemporary historians as to the fact, and of the constitutional writers of the next century as to the practice. It may be urged, and urged with much appearance of reason, that if

the calling of a Great Council, such as I suppose these to have been, was in those days a new or a very unusual thing, it would have made a noise at the time; and then how came Fabyan, or Polydore, or Hall, who were contemporaries, not to have heard of it? And that if on the contrary it was a thing frequent and familiar to people in the days of Henry the Seventh, it must have been familiar to students of the constitution in the days of Elizabeth and James the First; and then how came Sir Edward Coke, in the fourth part of his Institutes, to give an elaborate account of the constitution and functions of the Council, without alluding to a practice of such considerable constitutional importance;[1] or how was it that during the latter half of James the First's reign, when the government was in continual embarrassment from the opposition of the Lower House of Parliament, the experiment of reviving this practice, and calling a "Great Council" for deliberation and advice, was never (as far as I know) proposed for consideration or once mentioned, at least by that name?[2]

Fortunately it is not necessary to answer this question; for there is no doubt about the fact. That "Great Councils," precisely such as I suppose these to have been, were frequently summoned during the three reigns of the House of Lancaster, is a fact established by direct evidence altogether conclusive. In the *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, edited by Sir Harris Nicolas in 1834, there is dis-

[1] In the first part of the Institutes (ii. 10. 164.) Coke mentions the *Magnum Concilium* as meaning sometimes the Upper House of Parliament; and sometimes, when Parliament was not sitting, the "Peers of the realm, Lords of Parliament, who are called (he says) *Magnum Concilium Regis.*" But he says nothing of any peculiar function belonging to it, or of the occasions on which it was called.

[2] The Council before which Robert Earl of Essex was charged, heard, and censured on the 5th of June, 1600; and that before which James's Learned Counsel *recommended* that Sir Walter Raleigh should be charged and heard in 1618; were very like Great Councils both in composition and in function; but I do not find any allusion to the precedent in either case.

tinct mention made of not less than sixteen "Great Councils" called during the sixty-one years of the Lancastrian dynasty, and there are traces of more. The latest of which there is record there was in 1459; only twenty-six years before the accession of Henry the Seventh. And we are not to conclude, because this is the last recorded, that it was the last which took place: for the records of the proceedings of the Council from the end of Henry the Sixth's to nearly the end of Henry the Eighth's reign are almost all lost; and therefore the negative evidence is of no value. Positive evidence on the other hand is not wanting to show that the practice was in use at least seventeen years after. Twice in the Paston Correspondence we meet with news of the Council then sitting; which on both occasions the editor supposes (see table of contents) to mean Parliament; though it is certain that no Parliament was sitting at the time. One is stated to have ended on the 3rd of March 1473–4, the last day of Edward the Fourth's 13th year; the other as having begun on the 13th of February, in his 16th year; that is, 1476–7. See Vol. II. pp. 158. 205. This brings us within nine years of Henry the Seventh's accession. So that, even if that were the latest precedent, there would be nothing strange either in the name or the thing.

Of the distinctive character and functions of these Great Councils the clearest and most complete description which I have met with is in Sir Matthew Hale's *Jurisdiction of the House of Lords*, published by Hargrave in 1796;[1] but the

[1] "This *magnum consilium* was of two kinds; viz. a *magnum consilium* out of Parliament, and a *magnum consilium* in Parliament. The former of these was commonly upon some emergent occasion, that either in respect of the suddenness could not expect the summoning of Parliament, or in respect of its nature needed it not, or was intended but as preparative to it. . . . . But the form of these Great Councils was varied. For sometimes only some few of the prelates and nobility were called to it, and none of the *consilium ordinarium*, as *claus.* 33. *E.* 3. *m. dors.* At other times not only the nobility, prelates, and *consilium ordinarium* were called, but also there went out writs to every sheriff to return one knight for each county, and to divers cities and boroughs to return one citizen or burgess,

fullest and most authentic evidence, and that which comes nearest to the times in question, is to be found in the records published by Sir Harris Nicolas.

"They appear to have been summoned (he says) whenever affairs of greater moment occurred than the 'Continual Council' thought proper to determine, *but were not of such a nature or such a degree of importance as to render it advisable to bring them before Parliament.*" The Peers spiritual and temporal were considered as belonging to the Great Council of course; "Lords of the Great Council" appears to have been one of their titles. And it is probable that in ordinary cases it was composed (according to Mr. Hallam's conjecture; "Middle Ages" vol. iii. p. 213.) of these alone, in conjunction with the members of the "Continual" Council. But it is certain that on some special occasions many commoners were joined with them; specially selected from various qualities, professions, and localities, according to the nature of the question in debate. Thus, in the second year of Henry the Fourth, on the 20th of July, 1401, letters were addressed to the "Continual Council," commanding them (*pour certaines chargeantes matires touchantes nous et notre roiaume*) to summon all the Prelates, Earls, and Barons of the realm, *and from four to eight of the most sufficient and discreet Knights of each County*, to attend a Council at Westminster on the Feast of the Assumption next ensuing. And a second letter was addressed to them on the following day commanding that a certain number of *Esquires* should be likewise summoned to attend this Council. The object was

as was done *claus.* 27. *E.* 3. *m.* 12. *dors.* upon the making of the ordinance of the staple. But this *magnum consilium* had nothing of legislative power nor jurisdiction; and therefore the ordinances of the staple were after enacted by Parliament to supply the defect of a law. I never yet saw any private petition, or footsteps of jurisdiction exercised by such a Grand Council. — These Grand Councils have been rarely summoned of late years; businesses of state being usually despatched by the Privy Council, and if of very great importance in Parliament. The only Grand Council that hath been in my remembrance was that at York, at the coming in of the Scots." — Hale's *Jurisdiction of the House of Lords*, chap. 2. § 3.

to have their advice with regard to the war with France; and it appears from a list annexed that the Council was attended by about 150 Knights and Esquires, besides the Lords spiritual and temporal. (See Proceedings and Ordinances of the P. C. vol. i. p. 155., and Rymer viii. 213.)

Again, a minute of Council dated the 7th of March, 1442–3, (21 Hen. 6.) directs that there be "made letters under privy seal to *all the King's freemen*, and *also* to the King's Great Council, to be with the King in his Great Council at Westminster at the 15th of Pasque, all excusations ceasing, for the good of his realm, lordships, and subjects." (Proceedings and Ordinances, v. p. 237.) The occasion of this was also a French war.

I have selected these two instances as containing the most distinct mention that I can find of the summoning of persons who were not members of the King's Council by rank or office, and of their character and quality. In other cases they are less distinctly mentioned as "*et plusieurs autres*," or "*et aliorum ad illud convocatorum*." In others, and indeed in the majority, there are no traces of the presence of any persons besides the Lords and the members of the Continual Council. The questions on which they were summoned to advise and deliberate were not always questions of peace and war. Sometimes it was a question of raising money; as in the first year of Henry the Fourth, when in order to avoid the necessity of calling a Parliament and taxing the Commons, it was agreed that the Peers themselves should grant the King an aid, and that letters of Privy Seal should be sent to all the Abbots for the same purpose. (See Vol. I. p. 102.) And again in the third year of Henry the Fifth, when the Lords temporal, who had undertaken in a previous Parliament to do the King service in his wars upon certain terms of payment, consented to allow him a longer day for the payment, considering that the supplies granted by Parliament for the purpose could not be levied soon enough. (II. p. 150.) In the seventh year of Henry the Sixth, a

Great Council was summoned to advise upon a proposal that the King should be crowned in France, and also upon the means of supplying a deficiency in the revenue. In his ninth year a Great Council was summoned to advise upon the expediency of calling a Parliament. (IV. p. 67.) In the next year the question of the salary of the Lieutenant of England was referred to a Great Council. (IV. p. 105.) In his twelfth year, a proposal having been made for peace with Scotland by marriage of the King with one of the Scottish King's daughters, and the Continual Council having considered the proposition, but not liking to give advice on a matter of such weight, referred it to the King's uncles; who in their turn "doubting greatly to take upon them sole so great a charge," requested that a "Great Council" might be called to deliberate upon it. (IV. p. 191.) The minutes of the Council which was called in consequence (IV. 210–213.) and which met soon after the siege of Orleans and the beginning of the English reverses in France, make no mention of this subject; but of a dispute between the Dukes of Bedford and Gloucester, and a question as to the ways and means of raising 40 or 50,000*l.* for carrying on the war, according to a proposition of the Duke of Bedford. In the sixteenth year of Edward the Fourth, Sir John Paston informs his correspondent (vol. ii. p. 205.) that "yesterday began the Great Council; to which all the estates of the land shall come but if it be for great and reasonable excuses. And I suppose the chief cause of this assembly is to commune what is best to do now upon the great change by the death of the Duke of Burgoyne and for the keeping of Calais and the marches, and for the preservation of the amities taken late as well with France as now with the members of Flanders."

It is clear therefore that the reference to a "Great Council" of such questions as formed the subject of deliberation on the three occasions to which my conjecture refers was quite according to precedent. It would appear moreover from the minutes that the proceedings always began with a

speech by the Chancellor, setting forth the questions upon which they were called to deliberate and advise. So that in all but the name and the account of laws passed (which were in fact passed by the Parliament that met just before or just after), Bacon's narrative may be a correct report of the proceeding in each case.

No. II.

Perkyn Werbecks his Proclamation

published in the time of his Rebellion in the beginning of the Reign of H. 7.[1]

RICHARD by the grace of God King of England and of France, Lord of Ireland, Prince of Wales, to all those that these our present letters shall see hear or read, and to every of them, greeting: and whereas we in our tender age escaped by God's might out of the tower of London, and were secretly conveyed over the sea into other divers countries, there remaining certain years as unknown; in the which season it happened one Henry, son to Edmund Tydder, Earl of Richmond created, son to Owen Tydder, of low birth, in the country of Wales, to come from France and entered into this our realm; and by subtle false means to obtain the crown of the same unto us of right appertaining; which Henry is our extreme and mortal enemy as soon as he had knowledge of our being one live, imagined, compassed and wrought all the subtle ways and means he could devise to our

[1] Harl. MSS. 283. fo. 123. *b.* "The original of this, in an old written hand, is in the hands of Sir Robert Cotton; 18 August, 1616." — *Note in the hand of the transcriber.*

final destruction, insomuch as he hath not only falsely surmised us to be a feigned person, giving us nicknames so abusing your minds, but also to defer and put us from our entry into this our realm, hath offered large sums of money to corrupt the princes in every land and country and that we have been retained with and made importune labour to certain of our servants about our person some of them to murder our person, us [*sic*] and other to forsake and leave our righteous quarrel, and to depart from our service, as by Sir Robert Clifford and others was verified and openly proved, and to bring his cursed and malicious intent aforesaid to his purpose he hath subtilly and by crafty means levied outrageous and importable sums of moneys upon the whole body of our realm, to the great hurt and impoverishing of the same: all which subtle and corrupt labours by him made to our great jeopardy and peril, we have by God's might graciously escaped and overpassed, as well by land as by sea, and be now with the right high and mighty prince our dearest cousin the King of Scots, which without any gift or other thing by him desyred or demanded to the prejudice or hurt of us our crown or realm, hath full lovingly and kindly retained us, by whose aid and supportation we in proper person be now by God's grace entered into this our realm of England, where we shall shew ourselves openly unto you, also confounding our foresaid enemy in all his false sayings and also every man of reason and discretion may well understand that him needed not to have made the foresaid costages and importune labour if we had been such a feigned person as he untruly surmiseth, ascertaining you how the mind and intent of the foresaid noble prince our dearest cousin is, if that he may find or see our subjects and natural liege people according to right and the duty of their allegiance resort lovingly unto us with such power as by their puissance shall move, [*sic*, nowe?] be able of likelyhood to distress and subdue our enemies, he is fully set and determined to return home again quietly with his people into his own land, without doing or

done any hurt or prejudice unto our realm, or nts of the same. Also our great enemy to for- his false quarrel hath caused divers nobles of this our a whom he had suspect and stood in dread of, to be cru- elly murdered, as our cousin the Lord Fitzwater, Sir William Stanley, Sir Robert Chamberlaine, Sir Symon Mounteford, Sir Robert Radclyfe, William Daubeney, Humphrey Staf- ord, and many other, besides such as have dearly bought r lives, some of which nobles are now in the sanctuary: o he hath long kept and yet keepeth in prison our right irely well beloved cousin Edward son and heir to our cle Duke of Clarence and others, withholding from them ir rightful inheritance to the intent they ne should be of aught and power to aid and assist us at our need, after the duty of their leigeance. He hath also married by compulsion certain of our sisters and also the sister of our foresaid cousin the Earl of Warwick and divers other ladies of the od royal unto certain his kinsmen and friends of simple and low degree, and putting apart all well disposed nobles he hath none in favour and trust about his person but Bishop Foxe, Smith, Bray, Lovell, Oliver King, Sir Charles Somerset, David Owen, Rysley, Sir John Trobulvill, Tyler, Robert Lytton, Gylford, Chamley, Emson, James Hobert, John Cutte, Garthe, Hansey, Wyot, and such other caitiffs and villains of simple birth, which by subtle inventions and pilling of the people have been the principal finders, occasioners, and counsellors of the misrule and mischief now reigning in England.

Also we be credibly informed that our said enemy not regarding the wealth and prosperity of this land, but only the safeguard and surety of his person, hath sent into divers places out of our realm the foresaid nobles, and caused to be conveyed from thence to other places the treasure of this our realm, purposing to depart after in proper person with many other estates of the land being now at his rule and disposition, and if he should be so suffered to depart as God

defend it should be to the greatest hurt jeopardy and peril of the whole realm that could be thought or imagined. Wherefore we desire and pray you and nevertheless charge you and every of you as ye intend the surety of yourself and the commonweal of our land, your native ground, to put you in your most effectual devoirs with all diligence to the uttermost of your powers, to stop and let his passage out of this our realm, ascertaining you that what person or persons shall fortune to take or distress him shall have for his or their true acquittal in that behalf after their estate and degrees, so as the most low and simplest of degree that shall happen to take or distress him, shall have for his labour one thousand pounds in money, and houses and lands to the yearly value of one hundred marks to him and his heirs for ever. We remembering these premises with the great and execrable offences daily committed and done by our foresaid great enemy and his adherents in breaking the liberty and franchises of our mother holy Church to the high displeasure of Almighty God, besides the manifold treasons, abominable murders, manslaughters, robberies, extortions, the daily pilling of the people by dismes tasks tallages benevolences and other unlawful impositions and grievous exactions, with many other heinous offences to the likely destruction and desolation of the whole realm as God defend, shall put ourself effectually in our devoir, not as a step-dame but as the very true mother of the child, languishing or standing in peril to redress and subdue the foresaid mischief and misrule and to punish the occasioners and haunters thereof after their deserts in example of others. We shall also by God's grace and the help and assistance of the great lords of our blood with the counsel of other sad persons of approved policy prudence and experience dreading God and having tender zeal and affection to indifferent ministration of justice and the public weal of the land, peruse and call to remembrance the good laws and customs heretofore made by our noble progenitors kings of England and see them put in due

and lawful execution according to the effect and true meaning they were first made or ordained for, so that by virtue thereof as well the disinheriting of rightful heirs as the injuries and wrongs in anywise committed and done unto the subjects of our realm, both spiritual and temporal, shall be duly redressed according to right law and good conscience and we shall see that the commodities of our realm be employed to the most advantage of the same, the intercourse of merchandises betwixt realm and realm, to be ministered and handled as shall more be to the commonweal and prosperity of our subjects, and all such dismes tasks tallages benevolences unlawful impositions and grievous exactions as be above rehearsed utterly to be foredone and laid apart and never from henceforth to be called upon but in such causes as our noble progenitors kings of England have of old time been accustomed to have the aid succour and help of their subjects and true liegemen.

Also we will that all such persons as have imagined compassed or wrought privily or apertly since the reign of our foresaid enemy or before anything against us except such as since the reign have imagined our death shall have their free pardon for the same of their lives lands and goods, so that they at this time according to right and the duty of their allegiances take our righteous quarrel and part and aid comfort and support us with their bodies and goods.

And over this we let you wot that upon our foresaid great enemy his adherents and part-takers, with all other such as will take their false quarrel and stand in their defence against us with their bodies or goods, we shall come and enter upon them as their heavy lord and take and repute them and every of them as our traitors and rebels and see them punished according, and upon all other our subjects that according to right and the duty of their leigance will aid succour and comfort us with their powers with their [lives] or goods or victual our host for ready money, we shall come and enter upon them lovingly as their natural

leige lord and see they have justice to them equally ministered upon their causes: wherefore we will and desire you and every of you that incontinent upon the hearing of this our proclamation ye according to the duty of your allegiances aready yourselves in your best defensible array and give your personal attendance upon us where we shall then fortune to be, and in so doing ye shall find us your right especial and singular good lord and so to see you recompensed and rewarded as by your service shall be unto us deserved.

No. III.

CHARACTER OF HENRY VII.

(From the Latin Translation.)

Rex iste (ut verbis utamur quæ merita ejus exæquent) fuit instar miraculi cujusdam: ejus scilicet generis, quod prudentes attonitos reddit, imperitos leviter percellit. Plurima siquidem habuit et in virtutibus suis et in fortuna, quæ non tam in locos communes cadunt, quam in observationes prudentes et graves. Vir certe fuit pius ac religiosus, et affectu et cultu: sed ut erga superstitionem, pro modo temporum suorum, satis perspicax, ita interdum politicis rationibus et consiliis nonnihil occæcatus. Personarum ecclesiasticarum promotor, erga asylorum privilegia (quæ tanta ei mala pepererant) non durus. Haud pauca religiosorum cœnobia fundavit, dotavit; quibus accedit memorabile illud hospitale *Savoya* dictum. Magnus nihilominus eleemosynarius in secreto; quod luculenter indicat, etiam publica illa opera Dei gloriæ, non suæ, data. Pacem se summopere et amare, et pro viribus procurare, perpetuo præ se tulit. Atque illud in fœderum præfationibus illi frequens fuit; *Pacem, cum Chris-*

tus in mundum veniret, angelos præcinuisse; cum e mundo excederet, ipsum Dominum legasse. Neque hoc ei, timori aut animi mollitiei imputari poterat (quippe qui animosus fuerit et bellator), sed virtuti vere Christianæ et morali. Neque tamen illud eum fugit, a via pacis aberrare illum, qui eam nimio plus videatur appetere: itaque famas et rumores et apparatus belli sæpe excitabat, donec pacis conditiones in melius flecteret. Etiam illud notatu non indignum, quod tam sedulus pacis amator in bellis tam felix extiterit. Siquidem arma et expeditiones ejus neque in bellis externis neque in civilibus, unquam ei improspere cesserunt; neque noverat ille quid clades bellica esset. Bellum in adeptione regni, necnon Comitis Lincolniæ et Baronis Audlæi rebelliones, terminavit victoria. Bella Gallica et Scotica pax, sed pax ab hostibus ultro petita. Bellum illud Britanniæ, casus; mors nimirum Britanniæ ducis. Tumultus Baronis Lovelli, item Perkini, tam ad Exoniam quam in Cantio, fuga rebellium, antequam prælium tentarent: adeo ut propria ei fuerit armorum felicitas, atque inviolata. Cujus rei causa haud parva, quatenus ad seditiones intestinas compescendas, proculdubio fuit, quod in iis restinguendis personam suam nunquam subtraxerit. Prima quandoque pugnæ per duces suos transegit, cum ipse ad suppetias ferendas præsto esset: sed aliquam belli partem semper ipse attigit. Neque tamen hoc ipsum omnino propter alacritatem et fortitudinem, sed partim ob suspiciones, quod aliis parce fideret.

Leges regni in magno honore semper habuit, easque auctoritate sua munire videri voluit. Licet hoc ipsum non minimo quidem ei esset impedimento, ad ea quæ voluit pro arbitrio suo exequenda. Ita enim commode earum habenas tractavit, ut ne quid de proventibus suis, aut etiam prærogativa regia, intercideret. Attamen tali usus est temperamento, ut sicut interdum leges suas ad prærogativæ suæ jura traheret et prope torqueret; ita rursus per vices prærogativam suam ad legum æquabilitatem et moderationem consulto demitteret. Etenim et monetarum regimen, et belli ac pacis

tractatus et consilia, et rei militaris administrationem, (quæ omnino absoluti juris sunt) sæpenumero ad Comitiorum Regni deliberationes et vota referebat. Justitia, temporibus suis, recte et æquabiliter administrata fuit; præterquam cum rex in lite pars esset; præterquam etiam, quod consilium privatum regis communibus causis circa meum et tuum se nimis immisceret. Etenim consessus ille mera erat tum curia et tribunal justitiæ, præsertim sub regni sui initiis. Enimvero in illa justitiæ parte quæ fixa est et tanquam in ære incisa (hoc est prudentia legislatoria), prorsus excelluit. Justitiam etiam suam misericordia et clementia temperavit; utpote sub cujus regno tres tantum ex nobilitate pœna capitali affecti sunt: Comes nempe Warwicensis, Aulæ Regiæ Camerarius, et Baro Audleius. Quamvis priores duo instar multorum essent, quatenus ad invidiam et obloquia apud populum. At ne auditu quidem cognitum erat, tantas rebelliones tam parca sanguinis per gladium justitiæ missione expiatas fuisse, quam fuerunt duæ illæ insignes rebelliones, Exoniæ et prope Grenovicum. Severitas autem illa, satis cruenta, qua in primos illos infimæ conditionis homines qui Cantium appulerunt animadversum est, ad fæcem quandam populi tantum pertinebat. Diplomata autem illa generalia, quæ gratiam præteritorum rebellibus faciebant, perpetuo arma sua et præibant et sequebantur. Videre autem erat apud eum miram quandam et inusitatam gratiæ larga manu præbitæ et plane inexpectatæ cum suppliciorum severitate alternationem. Quod quidem, si tanti principis prudentiam cogitemus, minime inconstantiæ aut consiliorum vacillationi imputari poterit; sed aut causæ alicui secretæ, quæ jam nos latet; aut regulæ cuidam, quam sibi præscripserat, ut rigoris et mansuetudinis vias per vices experiretur. Sed quo minus sanguinis, eo plus pecuniæ haurire solebat. Atque ut nonnulli satis malevole interpretabantur, in altero fuit continentior ut in altero premeret magis: utrunque enim intolerabile plane fuisset. Natura proculdubio erat ad accumulandos thesauros pronior, et divitias plus quam pro fastigio suo admirabatur. Populus certe

quibus hoc natura inditum est, ad conservandas monarchias, ut principes suos excusent, licet sæpenumero minus juste in consiliarios eorum et ministros culpam rejiciant, hoc ipsum Mortono Cardinali et Reginaldo Braio consiliario imputabat: qui tamen viri (ut postea luculenter patebat) utpote qui pro veteri ipsorum apud eum auctoritate et gratia plurimum pollebant, ita ingenio ejus obsecundabant, ut id tamen nonnihil moderarentur: ubi contra qui sequebantur, Empsonus et Dudleius, viri nullius apud eum auctoritatis nisi quatenus cupiditatibus illius servilem in modum ministrabant, viam ei non tantum præberent, verum etiam sternerent, ad eas oppressiones et concussiones pro pecuniis undique excutiendis, quarum et ipsum sub finem vitæ suæ pœnituit, quibusque successor ejus renunciavit; quin et easdem diluere et expiare connixus est. Iste autem excessus tunc temporis complures nactus est interpretationes et glossas. Nonnulli in ea opinione erant, perpetuas rebelliones quibus toties vexatus fuit eum ad hoc redegisse, ut odio populum suum haberet. Alii judicium faciebant, hoc eo tendisse, ut ferocitatem populi reprimeret, eumque propter inopiam humiliorem redderet. Alii eum filio suo vellus aureum relinquere cupiisse. Alii denique, eum cogitationes secretas de bello aliquo externo animo agitâsse. Verum illi forsitan ad veritatem propius accedent, qui causas hujus rei minus longe petunt, easque attribuunt naturæ suæ, ætati ingravescenti, paci quæ opes alit, animoque nulla alia ambitione aut opere occupato. Quibus illud addere placet, eum, quod quotidie per occasiones varias inopiæ mala et difficiles pecuniarum conquisitiones in aliis principibus observaret, ex comparatione quadam plenarum arcarum felicitatem melius agnovisse. Quatenus ad modum quem servabat in thesauris impendendis, hoc habuit, ut nunquam sumptui parceret quem negotia sua postulabant: in ædificando magnificus, in remunerando tenacior: ita ut liberalitas sua potius se applicaret ad ea quæ ad statum suum proprium aut memoriam nominis sui pertinerent, quam ad præmia benemeritorum.

Fuit ille alti et excelsi animi; propriæ sententiæ, proprii consilii, amator; utpote qui seipsum revereretur, et ex se revera regnare vellet. Si privatæ conditionis fuisset, superbus proculdubio habitus esset: sed in principe prudente nihil aliud hoc fuit, quam ut intervallum et spatium justum et debitum inter se et subditos suos tueretur; quod certe erga omnes constanter tenuit; nemini propinquum permittendo aditum, neque ad auctoritatem suam neque ad secreta. A nullo enim ex suis regebatur. Regina, consors ejus, licet eum compluribus pulcherrimis liberis, quinetiam corona ipsa (utcunque illud fateri non sustineret), beâsset, parum apud eum potuit. Matrem magna sane reverentia prosecutus est, sed ad participationem consiliorum suorum raro admovit. Qui vero grati ob conversationem ipsi forent (qualis fuit Hastingus apud regem Edwardum quartum, aut Carolus Brandonus postea apud Henricum octavum) nulli fuerant; nisi forte inter tales numeraremus Foxum Episcopum, et Braium, et Empsonum; quod eos tam frequenter secum habuit. Sed non alio modo, quam sicut instrumentum plerunque secum habet artifex. Gloriæ inanis, si in aliquo alio principe, minimum in illo fuit; ita tamen ut de majestate, quam ad summum fastigium usque semper attollebat, nihil remitteret; haud ignarus, majestatis reverentiam populum in obsequio continere, inanem autem gloriam (si quis recte rem æstimet) reges populari auræ prostituere.

Erga fœderatos suos justum se et constantem præbuit, tectum tamen et cautum; sed contra, tam diligenter in eos inquirebat, se interim ita velans et reservans, ut illi aspicerentur, tanquam in lumine positi; ipse, veluti in tenebris collocatus, lateret: absque specie tamen hominis se occultantis, sed potius libere et familiariter communicantis negotia sua, atque de illorum rebus vicissim percontantis. Quantum autem ad pusillas illas invidias et æmulationes (quæ inter principes, haud parvo rerum suarum detrimento, intercedere solent), nihil tale in eo cernere erat; sed suas res sedulo et solide agebat. Atque certissimum est, existimationem ejus

n, in externis partibus adhuc majorem et illus- [illegible]. Exteri enim, qui negotiorum ejus ductus et [illegible]ias par[illegible]ares cernere non poterant, sed summas tantum [illegible]t exitus eorum intuebantur, eum perpetuo conflictari et perpetuo superiorem esse animadvertebant. Partim etiam in causa erant literæ et relationes legatorum exterorum, qui in comitatu aulæ suæ magno numero erant. Quibus non tantum comitate, muneribus, et colloquiis familiaribus satisfaciebat, verum in colloquiis illis suis haud parva admiratione illos [illegible]rstrinxit, cum viderent univer[illegible]n ejus rerum Europæa- [illegible]m notitiam. Quam licet ex ipsis legatis eorumque infor- [illegible]ationibus maxima ex parte hauserat, nihilominus quod ab universis collegerat admirationi erat singulis. Ita ut magna semper conscriberent ad superiores suos de prudentia ejus et artibus imperandi. Imo post reditum eorum in patrias suas, per literas de rebus omnimodis sc[illegible]u dignis eum frequenter certiorem faciebant. Tantæ fuit d[illegible]xteritatis in conciliandis sibi principum externorum ministris.

Omnibus profecto modis sollicitus erat de procuranda sibi et obtinenda rerum ubique occurrentium notitia. Quam ut assequeretur, non tantum exterorum ministrorum qui apud se residebant industria usus est, atque pensionariorum suorum quos tam in curia Romana quam alibi in aulis principum fovebat; verum etiam sui ipsius legatorum qui apud exteros perfungebantur. Quem in finem, mandata ejus usque ad curiositatem diligentissima erant, et per articulos ordine digestos; inter quos plures erant plerunque quæ ad inquisitionem quam quæ ad negotiationem pertinerent: exigendo responsa particularia et articulata, ad quæstiones suas respectiva.

Quantum vero ad emissarios suos, quos tam domi quam foras ad explorandas machinationes et conjurationes contra se initas subornabat; sane hoc, quo loco res suæ erant, apprime necessarium fuit. Tot in eum veluti talpæ subterraneæ perpetuo operam dabant, quo statum ejus labefactarent et subfoderent. Neque hoc illicitum habendum est. Etenim si in bello exploratores probantur adversus hostes legitimos,

multo magis adversus conjuratos et proditores. Verum ut fides hujusmodi exploratoribus concilietur per juramenta, et per execrationes, atque anathemata contra illos tanquam hostes fulminata, defensionem justam non capit. Sacra enim ista vestimenta larvis non conveniunt. Veruntamen habebat illud in se boni industria ista emissarios adhibendi, ut quemadmodum opera eorum multæ conjurationes detectæ, ita etiam fama eorum et diffidentia inde nata plurimæ ne tentarentur proculdubio cohibitæ fuerint.

Maritus erat minime uxorius, ne indulgens quidem; sed comis, et consortio blandus, et sine zelotypia. Erga liberos suos itidem paterno plenus affectu, magnam suscipiens curam de iis optime educandis; ad hoc etiam animi quadam altitudine aspirans, ut conditiones eis dignas et sublimes procuraret; honores quoque, quales amplitudinem eorum condecerent, ab omnibus deferri curavit; sed non admodum cupidus ut in oculis populi sui extollerentur.

Ad Sanctius Consilium suum plurima negotia referebat, ubi frequenter et ipse præsidebat; satis gnarus hoc pacto se via recta et solida insistere tam ad auctoritatem suam roborandam quam ad judicium suum informandum. Ad quem etiam finem, patiens fuit libertatis eorum, tam in suadendo quam in suffragia ferendo, donec animi sui sensum, quem ad finem deliberationum reservare solebat, declarâsset. Nobilitati suæ aliquantum gravis fuit, et ad negotia sua potius ecclesiasticos et jurisconsultos evehebat; qui magis ad obsequium parati, et apud populum minus gratiosi erant; quod quidem ut imperiose regnaret profuit, ut tuto non item. Adeo ut mihi persuasissimum sit, hunc ejus morem fuisse causam non exiguam crebrarum perturbationum quæ sub regimine suo contigerunt; propterea quod proceres regni, licet fidi et obedientes, non tamen alacriter cum eo cooperabantur; sed vota ejus magis eventui permittebant quam ad effectum urgebant. Nunquam sibi metuit a servis et ministris elatioribus ingeniis et virtutibus præditis; id quod in moribus erat Ludovico undecimo Galliæ regi: sed e contra ad sua negotia

qui suis temporibus maxime eminebant; quod
ri non potuit ut res suæ tam prospere cedere
se Hi erant, nimirum in rebus bellicis, Dux Bed-
ne, Co tes Oxoniæ, et Surriæ; Barones Daubeney, et
okus; et Poyningus, eques auratus. In rebus autem
vilibus, Mortonus, Foxus, Braius, Prior de Lanthony,
hamus, Urswicus, Frowicus, et alii. Neque ei curæ
at, quam vafri et callidi essent quibus negotia committebat.
utabat enim sui ipsius artes eorum artibus posse prædom-
ri. Sicut autem in min ligendis summo judicio
at; ita et in iis qu le rotegendis haud minore
atur constantia. quiddam est, quod licet
rinceps esset occulti et re sensus, et majorem in
modum suspicax, tempora quoque sua turbulenta et conjura-
tionum plena, spatio tamen viginti quatuor annorum quibus
regnavit nunquam consiliarium aliquem suum aut interiorem
ministrum dejecit aut discomposuit, excepto solo Stanleio,
Aulæ suæ Camerario. Quatenus vero ad subditorum suo-
rum erga eum affectus, ita res erat; ut ex tribus illis affecti-
bus qui corda subditorum erga principes suos devinciunt,
amore scilicet, metu, et reverentia; ultimo horum eximie
gauderet, secundo mediocriter, tertio autem tam parce, ut
reliquis duobus securitatem suam deberet.

Princeps erat subtristis, serius, et cogitabundus; quique secretas in animo suo observationes et curas foveret; cui etiam commentarioli et memoriæ manu propria scriptæ præsto semper erant, præcipue circa personas: quos nimirum ex subditis suis ad munia destinaret; quibus præmiorum debitor esset; de quibus inquirendum; a quibus cavendum; qui itidem essent inter se maxime aut factione aut meritis colligati, et veluti in partes descendissent; et similia; veluti diaria quædam cogitationum suarum componens et servans. Traditur etiam hodie narratio quædam faceta, cercopithecum suum (ab aliquo ex suis cubiculariis, ut creditum est, impulsum) die quodam præcipuum ex diariis suis, tunc forte incuriose positum, in frusta innumera discerpsisse. Ad quod

aulici, quibus anxia illa diligentia minime complacebat, risu prope disrumpebantur.

Quamvis autem esset apprehensionum et suspicionum plenus, attamen sicut facile eas admittebat, ita rursus dimittebat, easque judicio suo subjiciebat. Unde potius sibi ipsi molestæ, quam in alios periculosæ, existebant. Fatendum est tamen, cogitationes suas tam fuisse numerosas et complicatas ut simul stare sæpius non possent, sed quod in aliquibus prodesset ad alia obesset; neque fieri potuit ut adeo ultra mortale prudens esset aut felix, ut rerum pondera justa perpetuo exciperet. Certe rumor ille qui tot et tantas ei turbas concitavit, nempe quod dux Eboraci dimissus et adhuc superstes fuit, sub principiis vires et fidem ab ipso nactus est; quia scilicet hoc credi volebat, ut mollius ei imputaretur, quod in jure proprio et non in uxoris jure regnaret.

Affabilis fuit, et blanda quadam eloquentia pollens, magnaque prorsus uti consueverat verborum dulcedine et illecebris, cum aliquid suadere aut perficere vellet quod enixe cupiebat. Studiosus magis erat, quam eruditus; libros plerunque qui Gallica lingua conscripti erant legens. Licet Latinæ linguæ rudis non esset; quod ex eo patet, quod Hadrianus Cardinalis, et alii, quibus lingua Gallica satis familiaris erat, nihilominus Latine ad eum semper scriberent.

Quatenus ad delicias et voluptates hujus regis, muta prorsus est earum memoria. Nihilominus apparet ex mandatis illis quæ Marsino et Stilo circa reginam Neapolitanam dedit, eum de forma et pulchritudine ejusque partibus perite admodum interrogare potuisse. Cum voluptatibus sic agere solebat, ut reges magni cum mensis bellariorum; paulisper eas inspicientes, et statim terga vertentes. Neque enim unquam regnavit princeps qui magis negotiis suis deditus esset; totus in illis, et totus ex sese. Ita ut in hastiludiis et turneamentis et aliis pugnarum simulacris, nec-non saltationibus personatis et hujusmodi celebritatibus, potius cum dignitate quadam et comitate spectator esse videretur, quam iis magnopere capi aut delectari.

In eo proculdubio, ut in cæteris mortalibus universis (ac præcipue in regibus), fortuna influxum quendam habebat in mores, et mores vicissim in fortunam. Ad culmen regnum ascendit, non tantum a fortuna privata, quæ moderatione eum imbuere posset, verum etiam a fortuna exulis, quæ stimulos ei industriæ et sagacitatis addiderat. Tempora autem regiminis sui, cum essent potius prospera quam tranquilla, confidentiam ex successibus addiderant; naturam interim suam assiduis vexationibus fere perverterant. Prudentia autem ejus, per frequentes e periculis emersiones (quæ subitis eum remediis fidere docuerant), versa est potius in dexteritatem quandam seipsum e malis quando ingruerent extricandi, quam in providentiam illa ex longinquo arcendi et summovendi; sed et indole propria oculi mentis ejus non absimiles erant oculis quorundam corporalibus, qui ad objecta prope sita validi sunt, ad remotiora infirmi. Prudentia enim ejus occasione ipsa subito suscitabatur: atque eo magis, si occasioni accesserit periculum. Atque hæc fortuna in naturam suam potuit. Nec deerant rursus quæ natura sua fortunæ suæ imposuit. Nam sive hoc tribuendum sit providentiæ ejus defectui; aut in rebus quas decreverat pertinaciæ; aut suspicionibus, quæ aciem mentis ejus perstringebant; vel quicquid aliud in causa fuit; certum est, fortunæ suæ perturbationes continuas (præsertim nulla violenta occasione subnixas) exoriri non potuisse absque magnis aliquibus in natura sua impedimentis, et erroribus in constitutione animi sui radicali; quæ necesse habuit salvare et emendare per mille pusillas industrias et artes. Verum illa omnia apertius se produnt in historia ipsa. Veruntamen, intueamur licet eum cum defectibus suis omnibus, si quis eum cum regibus in Gallia et Hispania, contemporaneis suis, conferat; reperiet eum Ludovico duodecimo Galliarum regi, prudentia civili, et Ferdinando Hispaniarum, fide et candore, anteponi debere. At si Ludovicum duodecimum demas, et Ludovicum undecimum, qui paulo ante regnavit, substituas; magis convenient exempla, fierentque verius parallela. Illi enim

tres, Ludovicus, Henricus, et Ferdinandus, pro Tribus Magis censeri possunt inter illius ætatis principes. Ut verbo concludamus, si rex iste res majores non gessit, in causa ipse fuit sibi; quicquid enim suscepit, perfecit.

Corpòre erat Henricus decoro, statura justa paulo procerior, erectus, et membrorum compage bona, sed gracilis. Vultus erat talis quæ reverentiam incuteret, et aspectum viri ecclesiastici aliquantum referret. Et sicut minime erat obscurus aut superciliosus, ita neque blandus aut conciliator: sed tanquam facies hominis animo compositi et quieti: sed non commoda pictori; gratiosior scilicet facta cum loqueretur.

Hujus regis dignitas præcellens pati possit, ut memorentur narrationes quæpiam quæ ei divinum aliquid imponant. Cum matris ejus Margaretæ, fœminæ raris virtutibus ornatæ, nuptias multi proci ambirent; visa est videre in somniis virum quendam episcopo similem, habitu pontificali, tradere ei in manum Edmundum Comitem Richmondiæ, Henrici patrem, pro marito. Neque illa liberos unquam alios concepit, præter regem, licet tribus maritis nupta. Quodam etiam die festo, cum Henricus sextus (cui innocentia sanctitatem astruebat) a prandio lavaret, oculosque in Henricum, tunc adolescentulum, conjiceret, dixit: *Adolescens iste coronam, pro qua nos confligimus, pacifice tandem possidebit.* Sed quod vere in eo divinum censeri possit, hoc fuit; quod non minus fortunam boni Christiani quam magni regis sortitus sit; vita exercitata, morte pœnitenti. Ita ut non magis in mundanis quam spiritualibus victor triumphaverit; et militia ei in conflictibus tam peccati quam crucis prospere cesserit.

Natus est apud castrum Pembrochiæ, sepultus apud Westmonasterium, in monumento inter opera Europæ pulcherrimo et elegantissimo, sive capellam spectes sive sepulchrum. Adeo ut magnificentius jam in sepulchri sui monumento habitet mortuus, quam vivus aut Richmondiæ aut in alio quopiam palatio suo habitaverat. Optaverim ut idem ei contigisset in hoc famæ suæ monumento.

THE

BEGINNING OF THE HISTORY OF THE REIGN

OF

KING HENRY THE EIGHTH.

PREFACE.

THE history of Henry the Eighth was undertaken by desire of Prince Charles, to whom the history of Henry the Seventh was dedicated. The undertaking did not suit very well with Bacon's plans at that time; for it must have been a long business, owing to the quantity of original letters and other documents that had been preserved and must have been consulted, and he was now anxious to make the most of his time in pushing on his philosophical inquiries. He seems to have entered upon it without appetite and proceeded somewhat reluctantly. He had some difficulty also in obtaining free use of the requisite materials. Answering a letter from Tobie Matthew (then with the Prince and Buckingham in Spain) dated 26th of June, 1623, he writes, "Since you say the Prince hath not forgotten his commandment touching my history of Henry the Eighth, I may not forget my duty. But I find Sir Robert Cotton, who poured forth what he had in my former work, somewhat dainty of his materials in this." And in sending the Prince a copy of the *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, then newly published (22nd of October, 1623), he says, "For Henry the Eighth, to deal truly with your Highness, I did so despair of

my health this summer, as I was glad to choose some such work as I might compass within days: so far was I from entering into any work of length." How far he proceeded in gathering materials, or at what time this opening paragraph was written, we are not informed. But we know from Dr. Rawley that this was all he ever did of it.

It was published by Dr. Rawley in 1629, in a small volume entitled "Certain Miscellany works of the Right Hon. Francis Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Alban." But I have preferred to take the text from a manuscript copy in the British Museum (additional MSS. 5503, f. 120 b.): which I suspect to be a more original authority.

THE

HISTORY OF THE REIGN

OF

KING HENRY THE EIGHTH.

After the decease of that wise and fortunate King, King Henry the Seventh, who died in the height of his prosperity, there followed (as useth to do when the sun setteth so exceeding clear) one of the fairest mornings of a kingdom that hath been known in this land or anywhere else. A young King about eighteen years of age, for stature, strength, making, and beauty, one of the goodliest persons of his time. And although he were given to pleasure, yet he was likewise desirous of glory; so that there was a passage open in his mind by glory for virtue. Neither was he unadorned with learning, though therein he came short of his brother Arthur. He had never any the least pique, difference, or jealousy, with the King his father, which might give any occasion of altering court or counsel upon the change; but all things passed in a still. He was the first heir of the White and of the Red Rose; so that there was no discontented party now left in the kingdom, but all men's hearts turned towards him; and not only their hearts, but their eyes

also; for he was the only son of the kingdom. He had no brother; which though it be a comfort[1] for Kings to have, yet it draweth the subjects' eyes a little aside. And yet being a married man in those young years, it promised hope of speedy issue to succeed in the Crown. Neither was there any Queen Mother, who might share any way in the government or clash with the counsellors for authority, while the King intended his pleasure. No such thing as any great or[2] mighty subject who might eclipse[3] or overshade the imperial power. And for the people and state in general, they were in such lowness of obedience, as subjects were like to yield who had lived almost four and twenty years under so politic a King as his father; being also one who came partly in by the sword, and had so high a courage in all points of regality, and was ever victorious in rebellions and seditions of the people. The Crown extremely rich and full of treasure; and the kingdom like to be so in short time. For there was no war, no dearth, no stop of trade or commerce; it was only the Crown which sucked[4] too hard; but[5] now being full, and upon the head of a young King, it was like to draw the less.[6] Lastly, he was inheritor of his father's reputation, which was great throughout the world. He had strait alliance with the two neighbour states, an ancient enemy in former times, and an ancient friend, Scotland and Burgundy. He had peace and amity with France, under the assurance not only of treaty and league, but of necessity and inability in the French

[1] comfortable thing. R.
[2] and. R.
[3] any way eclipse. R.
[4] had sucked. R.
[5] and. R.
[6] was like to draw less. R.

to do him hurt, in respect the French King's designs were wholly bent upon Italy. So that it may be truly said, there had been scarcely seen or known in many ages such a rare concurrence of signs and promises of a happy and flourishing reign to ensue, as were now met in this young King, called after his father's name, Henry the Eighth.

THE BEGINNING

OF THE

HISTORY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

PREFACE.

"THE Beginning of the History of Great Britain" was first published in Rawley's Resuscitatio (1657). At what period it was composed we have no certain means of knowing. But there is a letter in the same volume described as a letter "to the King upon sending him a beginning of the history of his Majesty's times;" and we may presume that this was the paper which accompanied it. The letter is not dated. It is placed however in all the collections among those which belong to the early part of James's reign; and from a passage in another letter to the King, also undated but certainly written while Bacon was solicitor-general and apparently about the beginning of 1610, I should conjecture that it was composed a little before that time. His object in the last-mentioned letter was to obtain from the King a promise of the attorney's place, whenever it should be vacant; for "perceiving how at this time preferments of law flew about his ears, to some above him and to some below him,"[1] he had begun to think that, unless he had some better

[1] Alluding perhaps to the preferment of "one Bromley, an obscure lawyer," to a Barony of the Exchequer; of Sir Edward Philips to the Mastership of the Rolls, and of Sir Julius Cæsar to the reversion of that office: which was the news of January, 1609–10. See Chamberlain to Carleton; Court and Times of James I., vol. i. p. 103–4.

assurance of advancement in his present course, it would be better for him to give it over, "and to make proof (he proceeds) to do you some honour by my pen, either *by writing some faithful narrative of your happy though not untraduced times*, or by recompiling your laws, which I perceive your Majesty laboreth with and hath in your head,[1] than to spend my wits and time in this laborious place," and so on.

The letter which accompanied the history runs thus:

"Hearing that your Majesty is at leisure to peruse story,[2] a desire took me to make an experiment what I could do in your Majesty's times; which being but a leaf or two, I pray your pardon if I send it for your recreation; considering that love must creep where it cannot go. But to this I add these petitions. First, that if your Majesty do dislike anything, you would conceive I can amend it upon your least beck. Next, that if I have not spoken of your Majesty encomiastically, your Majesty would be pleased only to ascribe it to the law of an history, which doth not clutter together praises upon the first mention of a name, but rather disperseth and weaveth them through the whole narrative. And as for the proper place of commemoration, which is in the period of life, I pray God I may never live to write it. Thirdly, that the reason why I presumed to think of the oblation was because, what-

[1] Alluding perhaps to the King's Speech in the Banqueting Hall, 21 March, 1609–10. State Paper Office, vol. liii. (domestic) no. 31. See also Winwood's Memorials, iii. p. 136.

[2] Alluding probably to Camden's Annals of Queen Elizabeth, which the King was reading and criticising in the MS. about the beginning of 1610, and of which he sent a considerable portion to the French historian De Thou towards the close of that year. Compare Bacon's letter to Sir R. Cotton, 7 April, 1610, with Chamberlain's to Carleton, 29 Jan. 1610–11.

soever my disability be, yet I shall have that advantage which almost no writer of history hath had, in that I shall write of times not only since I could remember, but since I could observe. And lastly, that it is only for your Majesty's reading."

I am the more inclined to assign the composition of this little historical piece to the latter end of 1609 or the beginning of 1610, because I find no allusion to it either before or after as one of Bacon's projected works. And I suppose that he abandoned the design altogether, either because the King did not encourage him to proceed, or because, after the Earl of Salisbury's death which happened early in 1612, he had no prospect of leisure; being fully engaged in the business of the day, and all the time he had to spare being devoted to his philosophy.

Mr. Craik (*Bacon and his writings;* vol. i. p. 213.) says it was probably written in 1624. But if so Dr. Rawley would surely have mentioned it in his list of the works written by Bacon during the last five years of his life.

As an account of the temper of men's minds at James's entrance, it is complete; and in my judgment one of the best things in its kind that Bacon ever wrote.

THE BEGINNING

OF THE

HISTORY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

By the decease of Elizabeth, Queen of England, the issues of King Henry the Eighth failed; being spent in one generation and three successions. For that King, though he were one of the goodliest persons of his time, yet he left only by his six wives three children; who reigning successively and dying childless, made place to the line of Margaret, his eldest sister, married to James the Fourth King of Scotland. There succeeded therefore to the kingdom of England James the Sixth, then King of Scotland, descended of the same Margaret both by father and mother; so that by a rare event in the pedigrees of Kings, it seemed as if the Divine Providence, to extinguish and take away all note of a stranger, had doubled upon his person, within the circle of one age, the royal blood of England by both parents. This succession drew towards it the eyes of all men; being one of the most memorable accidents that had happened a long time in the Christian world. For the kingdom of France having been reunited in the age before in all the provinces thereof

formerly dismembered; and the kingdom of Spain being of more fresh memory united and made entire by the annexing of Portugal in the person of Philip the Second; there remained but this third and last union, for the counterpoising of the power of these three great monarchies, and the disposing of the affairs of Europe thereby to a more assured and universal peace and concord. And this event did hold men's observations and discourses the more, because the Island of Great Britain, divided from the rest of the world, was never before united in itself under one King; notwithstanding the people be of one language, and not separate by mountains or great waters; and notwithstanding also that the uniting of them has been in former times industriously attempted both by war and treaty. Therefore it seemed a manifest work of Providence and case of reservation for these times; insomuch as the vulgar conceived that there was now an end given and a consummation to superstitious prophecies (the belief of fools, but the talk sometimes of wise men), and to an ancient tacit expectation which had by tradition been infused and inveterated into men's minds. But as the best divinations and predictions are the politic and probable foresight and conjectures of wise men, so in this matter the providence of King Henry the Seventh was in all men's mouths, who, being one of the deepest and most prudent princes of the world, upon the deliberation concerning the marriage of his eldest daughter into Scotland, had by some speech uttered by him showed himself sensible and almost prescient of this event.

Neither did there want a concurrence of divers rare external circumstances (besides the virtues and condi-

tion of the person) which gave great reputation to this succession. A king, in the strength of his years, supported with great alliances abroad, established with royal issue at home, at peace with all the world, practised in the regiment of such a kingdom as mought rather enable a king by variety of accidents than corrupt him with affluence or vain glory; and one that besides his universal capacity and judgment, was notably exercised and practised in matters of religion and the church; which in these times by the confused use of both swords are become so intermixed with considerations of estate, as most of the counsels of sovereign princes or republics depend upon them. But nothing did more fill foreign nations with admiration and expectation of his succession, than the wonderful and (by them) unexpected consent of all estates and subjects of England for the receiving of the King without the least scruple, pause, or question. For it had been generally dispersed by the fugitives beyond the seas (who partly to apply themselves to the ambition of foreigners, and partly to give estimation and value to their own employments, used to represent the state of England in a false light), that after Queen Elizabeth's decease there must follow in England nothing but confusions, interreigns, and perturbations of estate; likely far to exceed the ancient calamities of the civil wars between the houses of Lancaster and York, by how much more the dissensions were like to be more mortal and bloody when foreign competition should be added to domestical, and divisions for religion to matter of title to the crown. And in special, Parsons the Jesuit, under a disguised name, had not long before published an express treatise, wherein whether his mal-

ice made him believe his own fancies, or whether he thought it the fittest way to move sedition, like evil spirits which seem to foretell the tempest they mean to move, he laboured to display and give colour to all the vain pretences and dreams of succession which he could imagine; and thereby had possessed many abroad, that knew not the affairs here, with those his vanities. Neither wanted there here within this realm divers persons both wise and well affected, who though they doubted not of the undoubted right, yet setting before themselves the waves of people's hearts (guided no less by sudden temporary winds than by the natural course and motion of the waters), were not without fear what mought be the event. For Queen Elizabeth, being a Prince of extreme caution, and yet one that loved admiration above safety, and knowing the declaration of a successor mought in point of safety be disputable, but in point of admiration and respect assuredly to her disadvantage, had from the beginning set it down for a maxim of estate to impose a silence touching succession. Neither was it only reserved as a secret of estate, but restrained by severe laws, that no man should presume to give opinion or maintain argument touching the same; so though the evidence of right drew all the subjects of the land to think one thing, yet the fear of danger of law made no man privy to other's thought. And therefore it rejoiced all men to see so fair a morning of a kingdom, and to be thoroughly secured of former apprehensions; as a man that awaketh out of a fearful dream. But so it was, that not only the consent but the applause and joy was infinite and not to be expressed throughout the realm of England upon this succession; whereof the consent

(no doubt) may be truly ascribed to the clearness of the right; but the general joy, alacrity, and gratulation were the effects of differing causes. For Queen Elizabeth, though she had the use of many both virtues and demonstrations that mought draw and knit unto her the heart of her people, yet nevertheless carrying a hand restrained in gift and strained in points of prerogative, could not answer the votes either of servants or subjects to a full contentment; especially in her latter days, when the continuance of her reign (which extended to five and forty years) mought discover in people their natural desire and inclination towards change; so that a new court and a new reign were not to many unwelcome. Many were glad, and especially those of settled estate and fortunes, that the fears and incertainties were overblown and that the dye was cast: others that had made their way with the King or offered their service in the time of the former Queen, thought now the time was come for which they had prepared: and generally all such as had any dependance upon the late Earl of Essex (who had mingled the secrecy of his own ends with the popular pretence of advancing the King's title) made account their cause was amended. Again such as mought misdoubt they had given the King any occasion of distaste, did continue[1] by their forwardness and confidence to shew it was but their fastness to the former government, and that those affections ended with the time. The Papists nourished their hopes by collating the case of the Papists in England and under Queen Elizabeth and the case of the Papists in Scotland under the King; interpreting that the condition of them in

[1] So in the original. Bacon probably wrote "contend."

Scotland was the less grievous, and divining of the King's government here accordingly; besides the comfort they ministered themselves from the memory of the Queen his mother. The ministers, and those which stood for the Presbytery, thought their cause had more sympathy with the discipline of Scotland than the hierarchy of England, and so took themselves to be a degree nearer their desires. Thus had every condition of persons some contemplation of benefit which they promised themselves; overreaching perhaps, according to the nature of hope, but yet not without some probable ground of conjecture. At which time also there came forth in print the King's book, entitled Βασιλικὸν Δῶρον, containing matter of instruction to the Prince his son touching the office of a king; which book falling into every man's hand filled the whole realm as with a good perfume or incense before the King's coming in. For being excellently written, and having nothing of affectation, it did not only satisfy better than particular reports touching the King's disposition; but far exceeded any formal or curious edict or declaration which could have been devised of that nature, wherewith Princes at the beginning of their reigns do use to grace themselves, or at least express themselves gracious, in the eyes of their people. And this was, for the general, the state and constitution of men's minds upon this change. The actions themselves passed in this manner, etc.

[The rest is wanting.]

IN

FELICEM MEMORIAM

ELIZABETHÆ.

PREFACE.

THE earliest notice of the following piece which I have met with is in a letter from Mr. John Chamberlain to Mr. Dudley Carleton, dated December 16, 1608. "I come even now," he says, "from reading a short discourse of Queen Elizabeth's life, written in Latin by Sir Francis Bacon. If you have not seen nor heard of it, it is worth your enquiry; and yet methinks he doth *languescere* towards the end, and falls from his first pitch: neither dare I warrant that his Latin will abide test or touch."[1]

About the same time, or not long after, Bacon himself sent a copy of it to Sir George Carew, then ambassador in France, with a letter which, though undated, enables us to fix the composition of it with tolerable certainty in the summer of 1608. "This last summer vacation (he says), by occasion of a factious book that endeavoured to verify *Misera Fœmina* (the addition of the Pope's Bull) upon Queen Elizabeth, I did write a few lines in her memorial; which I thought you would be well pleased to read, both for the argument and because you were wont to bear affection to my pen. *Verum ut aliud ex alio*, if it came handsomely to pass, I would be glad the President De Thou (who hath

[1] Court and Times of James I., i. 83.

written a history, as you know, of that fame and diligence) saw it; chiefly because I know not whether it may not serve him for some use in his story; wherein I would be glad he did right to the truth and to the memory of that Lady, as I perceive by that he hath already written he is well inclined to do."

In answering a letter from Tobie Matthew dated February 10 [1608–9], Bacon sent him also a copy of this tract; with the following remarks. "I send you also a memorial of Queen Elizabeth, to requite your eulogy of the late Duke of Florence's felicity. Of this when you were here I shewed you some model; at what time methought you were more willing to hear Julius Cæsar[1] than Queen Elizabeth commended. But this which I send is more full, and hath more of the narrative: and further hath one part that I think will not be disagreeable either to you or to that place; being the true tract of her proceedings towards the Catholics, which are infinitely mistaken. And though I do not imagine they will pass allowance there, yet they will gain upon excuse." Tobie Matthew, who had joined the Catholic Church not long before, could not quite allow this part himself, and appears to have taken exceptions to it in his reply. Upon which Bacon writes again, apparently in the summer of 1609, "For that of Queen Elizabeth, your judgment of the temper and truth of that part which concerns some of her foreign proceedings, concurs fully with the judgment of others to whom I have communicated part of it; and as things go, I suppose they are likely to be more and

[1] Alluding possibly to the *Imago Civilis Julii Cæsaris;* the piece which stands next but one in this volume, and of which we know nothing but that Dr. Rawley found it among Bacon's papers, and printed it along with the *Opuscula Philosophica* in 1658.

more justified and allowed. And whereas you say, for some other part, that it moves and opens a fair occasion and broad way into some field of contradiction, on the other side it is written to me from the lieger at Paris [Sir G. Carew] and some others also, that it carries a manifest impression of truth with it, and that it even convinces as it grows. These are their very words; which I write not for mine own glory, but to show what variety of opinion rises from the dispositions of several readers. And I must confess my desire to be, that my writings should not court the present time or some few places, in such sort as might make them either less general to persons or less permanent in future ages." Upon this Matthew seems to have written a rejoinder on the 4th of August, to which Bacon merely replies, "As for the memorial of the late deceased Queen, I will not question whether you be to pass for a disinteressed man or no; I freely confess myself am not, and so I leave it."

"This work," says Dr. Rawley writing in 1657, "his Lordship so much affected that he had ordained by his last will and testament to have had it published many years since; but that singular person entrusted therewith soon after deceased, and therefore it must expect a time to come forth amongst his Lordship's other Latin works:"[1] — alluding to the volume of *Opuscula philosophica* which was published in the next year, and in which it first appeared.

The will of which Dr. Rawley speaks, and of which Tenison has given an extract in the *Baconiana*, was probably a draft only, not a copy; for in Bacon's last will there is no mention of this piece. And as in

[1] Epistle to the Reader, in the Resuscitatio.

is distinguished from his other papers by ion of a particular wish that it should be t is not improbable that he had proceeded take special measures to secure that object, by put- g it into the hands of that "singular person" to whom Dr. Rawley alludes. This would account for the omission of the clause relating to it in his last will of all, and also for the separation of the manuscript from his other papers, and afterwards (upon the death the person entrusted with it) for its being locked up mislaid. Considering moreover that it related to te affairs with which Bacon's official position had le him acquainted, he may have thought that it ht not to be published without the sanction of a y Councillor, — for we know that he had this ple with regard to the publication of his own letters;[1] — and among all the Privy Councillors then living the man whom he would most naturally select for such a trust was his old and much revered friend Bishop Andrews, who survived him only by a few months. This is only a guess; but if true, it explains why Bacon did not propose to include this piece among his *Opera Moralia et Civilia* (though that indeed might be sufficiently accounted for by the probability that it would have caused the volume to be prohibited in Italy), and how the publication of it came to be so long delayed.

But however this may be, the fact with which we are principally concerned is the value which Bacon

[1] "Also whereas I have made up two register-books, the one of my orations or speeches, the other of my epistles or letters, whereof there may be use, and yet because they touch upon business of state they are not fit to be put into the hands but of some counsellor, I do devise and bequeathe them," &c. — *Last Will.*

himself set upon it: and of this the draft of the will affords conclusive evidence. The work is important, because it relates to a series of proceedings which Bacon had watched almost from the beginning with anxious interest and from a position very favourable for observation; and because it was written at a time when he could have had no other motive in writing it than a wish to bear witness to what he believed to be the truth. For though I do not myself believe that which has been commonly asserted, upon the evidence, I think, chiefly of strangers or slanderers, — that the depreciation of Elizabeth was popular at court, — there was certainly nothing to be gained by flattering her. And if Bacon was not a disinterested witness, as he confesses he was not, it was only because the impression which her character and conduct had made upon him was so favourable that he had grown partial; and this very partiality must be accepted as a historical fact, — not the least significant among the many testimonies which history bears in her favour.

It cannot have been for its literary merit that Bacon especially valued this writing; for the style is more than usually hasty and careless, and there is some truth in Mr. Chamberlain's criticism that it falls off a little towards the end; a defect which a very little trouble would have removed.

The passage in which he alludes to the death of Anne Boleyn is interesting; and the more so because his argument did not oblige him to make any allusion to it, and he appears to me to have gone purposely out of his way to bring it in. Had his argument required him to show that the felicity of Elizabeth began with her parents, the case would have been desperate. Her

mother having been put to death by her father upon a charge of incest and adultery, there must have been either the most awful guilt in one of them or the most awful calamity to both. And therefore when I find Bacon, in an argument designed to prove the constant felicity of Elizabeth's fortune, deliberately and unnecessarily introducing such a topic, — I say unnecessarily, because it is brought in only with reference to the question as to the "dignity of her birth," that is whether she was really a king's daughter, — I conclude that he was only making an occasion to place on record Anne's last message (which he afterwards inserted in his collection of Apophthegms) and his own opinion of her innocence.

What weight is due to that opinion, one cannot well say without knowing how much he knew of the circumstances. There was naturally a strong inclination on the part of the Protestants in Elizabeth's time to believe Anne Boleyn innocent. This inclination would naturally be exasperated into passion by the slanders and invectives of the Catholics. Of the evidence produced at the trial there was no accessible record, and the position of Elizabeth herself between her father's memory and her mother's forbade the question to be openly or freely discussed. It is probable therefore that his impression was formed upon rumours and charitable surmises of no very authentic or trustworthy character; and that of the nature of the direct evidence he did not know more than we do now. Not so however with regard to the weight of the verdict. Of the value to be attached to the judgment of the Peers in a trial for treason and to an attainder by Parliament, Bacon must have been a much better judge than

any one can be now, standing as he did so much nearer the time, and so well versed as he was in the details of similar proceedings half a century later. We cannot suppose him to have been ignorant of the composition of the tribunal which found Anne Boleyn guilty, and yet it is clear that he did not on that account find it impossible to believe her innocent. Most true it is no doubt, as Mr. Froude has well pointed out, that the assumption of Anne Boleyn's innocence involves an assumption that not Henry only, but also Peers and Parliament, were deeply guilty. But it is a grave fact that Bacon, writing within little more than seventy years of the time, and being himself a middle aged man with much experience of courts and Parliaments, did not regard it as an assumption which must be dismissed as incredible.

In so far as the balance of probabilities depends upon our estimate of Henry's personal character, his judgment is of less importance. Of that (although he may no doubt in his boyhood have heard something from his father, who had had opportunities of personal observation) he probably took his impression from the popular historians, who had little to guide them beyond the naked outline of Henry's public proceedings, and were not in a position to see below the surface. When the particular difficulties with which he had to deal were forgotten, and the rapid succession of violent changes had altered the relative position of all parties and the complexion of all interests, the chronicle of his reign exhibited a series of violent proceedings,—leagues of amity and marriage alliances with neighbour kings followed by quarrels and wars, divorces of wives followed suddenly by fresh marriages,

great ministers suddenly disgraced and execut
alties of heresy enforced now against Cathol
against Protestants, — of which the popular
tation was simple and obvious. To a superf
server they could but appear as the actions o
violent in love and anger, and imperious in w
such no doubt was the general impression of
character in the beginning of the seventeenth
Odious to his contemporaries he certainly w
nor was his memory odious in the eyes of
next generations: our modern notion of hir
I think, of much later date, when his actic
seen refracted through an atmosphere of opi
tirely changed. But though of the Protesta
rians who wrote before the Commonwealth tl
censure his actions most freely speak with
as well as respect of the man, I suppose none
would have disputed Bacon's assertion that
a man by nature extremely prone both to
jealousy, and that his attachment to Jane
preceded his anger against Anne Boleyn.
the simple sequence of events, this is the na
planation of them. It is quite possible howe
it is not the true one. In these times, when
ceedings of the government are called in
the first thing is to ask for the "papers" re
them: till these are produced it is felt that
cannot be judged. Now the papers relatin
transactions of Henry the Eighth were not
till long after the popular judgment had been
the most important part of them only within
few years; and it seems that they suggest a n
ing of his character in many points; showin

other things that the imputation of a "natura ad *amores* propensissima" must be given up. This is not the place for a discussion of the question, but it is proper that Bacon's opinion, which would otherwise be of great value in such a matter, should be taken with this caution. There can be no doubt that Mr. Froude's plea for a reconsideration of the judgment is reasonable, and that he has asked some questions which it is at least very difficult to answer.

For the text of this piece I have used two authorities, each of which may be considered as original and independent. One is Dr. Rawley's edition, printed along with the *Opuscula Philosophica* in 1658, with the title *Opus illustre in felicem memoriam Elizabethæ, Angliæ, Reginæ, auctore nobilissimo heroe Francisco Bacono, Barone de Verulamio, Vicecomite Sancti Albani; multis retro annis prælo designatum, sed non antehac in lucem editum;* the other is a manuscript copy in the British Museum (Harl. 6797. fo. 79.), written in the hand of one of Bacon's own people, though it bears no traces of revision by Bacon himself. It cannot, I think, have been the same which Rawley used; and as he gives no particulars about the one which he did use, we are left to decide for ourselves which is the best, from internal evidence.[1] My own impression is that Rawley's manuscript must have been the less perfect, and that some of the dif-

[1] The following sentence contains all that he says about it. "His monumentum illud Regium, cui titulus *In felicem memoriam Elizabethæ Angliæ Reginæ*, inter opera civilia primum adjunxi, ante annos complures ab ipso honoratissimo auctore (si Deus annuisset) typis designatum: Cæterum quamvis obdormisse diu non tamen penitus expirasse jam compertum est."

ferences which appear in his printed copy are corrections or conjectural emendations of his own. Where the two copies differ therefore and the true reading seems doubtful, I have generally preferred that of the manuscript; but in all cases, whichever I have received into the text, I have given the other in the notes; and therefore every reader can choose for himself.

As the principal pieces which belong to this division of Bacon's works are English, the Latin pieces being few and comparatively short and not connected with one another, I have thought it better to print the translation of each immediately after the original, instead of collecting them into a body at the end; and as this is the first for the translation of which I am myself solely responsible, I shall add here a few words to explain the principle upon which I have attempted to do them.

My object in all my attempts at translation being, not to help a Latin reader to construe the original, but to put English readers in possession of the sense of it, my plan has been first to take as clear an impression as I could of the meaning and effect of the Latin, and then to reproduce that meaning in the best and clearest and most readable English that I could command: not tying myself to the particular form which the Latin sentence assumes, even where it could be preserved without awkwardness or obscurity, — nor even preferring it, — but always adopting that form in which I could best express the thing; keeping myself as faithful as possible to the effect of the original, — not the literal and logical meaning only, but the effect upon the imagination and the feelings, —

and leaving myself as free as possible with regard to the mode of bringing it out. How far I have succeeded it is for others to say; but my endeavour has been to produce a translation from the perusal of which the reader shall rise with the same feelings with which he would have risen from the perusal of the original had the language of it been familiar to him.

I am of course aware that there are not only many people who would prefer for their own purposes a different kind of translation, but also some real objections to this kind which upon the whole nevertheless I prefer myself. Whether I have judged rightly, is a question which can only be determined by the effect upon readers generally. If my translations give a livelier and juster impression of the original, it will be found that most people like them better.

IN

FELICEM MEMORIAM ELIZABETHÆ

ANGLIÆ REGINÆ.[1]

ELIZABETHA et natura et fortuna mirabilis inter fœminas, memorabilis inter principes fuit. Neque hæc res indicium monachi alicujus, aut hujusmodi censoris umbratilis desiderat. Nam isti homines, stylo acres, judicio impares, et partis suæ memores, rerum minus fideles testes sunt. Ad principes viros pertinet hæc cognitio, atque ad eos qui imperiorum gubernacula tractarunt, et rerum civilium ardua et arcana norunt. Rarum in omni memoria est[2] muliebre imperium; rarior in eo felicitas; rarissima cum felicitate diuturnitas. Illa vero quadragesimum quartum regni sui annum complevit; neque tamen felicitati suæ superstes fuit. De hac felicitate pauca dicere institui; neque in laudes excurrere. Nam laudem[3] homines tribuunt, felicitatem Deus.

Primum in parte felicitatis pono, quod ad imperatorium fastigium a privata fortuna evecta est.[4] Siquidem hoc in moribus et opinionibus hominum penitus insedit,

[1] Harl. MSS. 6797. fo. 79.
[2] *est memoria.* R.
[3] *laudem enim.* R.
[4] *sit.* R.

ut quæ præter spem et expectationem eveniunt majori felicitati deputentur; sed non hoc est quod volo. Illud intueor; principes qui in domo regnatrice et ad spem successionis non dubiam nutriti sunt, ab educationis indulgentia et licentia depravatos, plerumque et minus capaces et minus moderatos evadere. Itaque optimos et excellentissimos reges reperias, quos utraque fortuna erudiit. Talis apud nos fuit Henricus septimus, et apud Gallos Ludovicus duodecimus, qui recenti memoria et eodem fere tempore non tantum a privata, sed etiam ab adversa et exercita fortuna, regnum accepere; atque ille prudentia, hic justitia floruere. Similis fuit et hujusce principis ratio; cujus initia et spes variavit fortuna, ut in principatu ad extremum erga illam constans et æquabilis esset. Nam Elizabetha natalibus suis successioni destinata, dein[1] exhæredata, tum posthabita fuit. Eadem regno fratris fortuna magis propitia et serena, regno sororis magis turbida et ancipiti usa est. Neque tamen ex vinculis subito in regnum assumpta est, ut ab infortunio exacerbata intumesceret; sed libertati restituta, et expectatione aucta, tum demum regnum sine tumultu aut competitore placide et felicissime obtinuit. Atque hæc ideo adducimus, ut appareat Divinam Providentiam, optimam principem meditatam, per istiusmodi disciplinæ gradus eam præparasse et extulisse. Neque sane natalium dignitati calamitas matris obesse debet; cum præsertim satis constet Henricum octavum prius amori novo quam iræ adversus Annam indulsisse; ejusque regis natura et ad amores et ad suspiciones propensissima, et in iisdem usque ad sanguinem præceps, posteritatis notam non effugiat. Adde, quod criminatione, vel personæ ipsius

[1] *deinde.* R.

ad quem referebatur nomine, minus probabili et tenuissimis conjecturis innixa, circumventa erat; quod et fama etiam tum occulto ut solet murmure excepit, et Anna ipsa celso animo et memorabili voce sub tempus mortis suæ detestata[1] est. Nacta enim nuntium ut existimabat et fidum et benevolum, eadem hora qua ad mortem se parabat hujusmodi mandata ad regem perferenda dedit: Regem in ipsa novis honoribus cumulanda institutum suum optime servare et perpetuo tueri; cum illam primum, generosa stirpe ortam sed nobilitatis titulis non insignitam, dignitate marchionissæ ornasset, deinde in reginam et consortem suam[2] accepisset; et postremo, quia non restabat terreni honoris gradus altior, innocentem ad coronam martyrii evehere voluisset. Atqui nuntius ille ad regem alio amore flagrantem hoc perferre non aüsus est; sed fama veritatis vindex ad posteros pertulit.

Atque non exigua[3] pars felicitatis Elizabethæ, etiam mensura ac veluti curriculum ipsum regni[4] sui nobis visum est: non tantum quia diuturnum, sed quia spatium illud ætatis suæ occupavit, quod rerum moderamini et habenis regni flectendis et moliendis aptissimum esset. Annos enim viginti quinque (qua ætate curatura finitur) nata cum regnare inciperet, ad septuagesimum ætatis annum imperium produxit. Itaque nec pupillæ detrimenta et aliena arbitria, nec rursus exactæ et ægræ senectutis incommoda experta est. Senectus autem, etiam privatis, miseriarum satis; sed regibus, præter communia ætatis mala, adhuc status sui declinationes et inglorios exitus afferre solet. Nemo enim fere in regno ad multam et invalidam senectutem pertingit,

[1] *protestata.* R.
[2] *in regni et thori consortium.* R.
[3] *non exigua sane.* R.
[4] *regiminis.* R.

quin aliquam imperii et existimationis diminutionem[1] patiatur. Cujus rei exemplum maxime eminet in Philippo secundo rege Hispaniarum, principe potentissimo et imperandi peritissimo; qui extremis suis temporibus et fessa ætate hoc quod diximus penitus sensit, ideoque prudentissimo consilio se rerum conditioni submisit; territoriis in Galliis acquisitis se ipse mulctavit, pacem ibidem firmavit, alibi tentavit, ut res compositas atque integra omnia posteris relinqueret. Contra, Elizabethæ fortuna tam constans et valida fuit, ut nec ulla rerum declinatio vergentem certe, sed tamen adhuc vigentem, ætatem sequeretur: atque insuper, in signum felicitatis suæ certissimum, non prius diem obiret[2] quam de defectione in Hibernia prospero prælii eventu decretum esset; ne gloria ejus aliqua ex parte deformata et imperfecta videretur.

Etiam[3] illud cogitandum censeo, in quali populo imperium tenuerit. Si enim in Palmyrenis, aut Asia imbelli et molli, regnum sortita esset, minus mirandum fuisset; cum effœminato populo fœmina princeps competeret: verum in Anglia, natione ferocissima et bellicosissima, omnia ex nutu fœminæ moveri et cohiberi potuisse, summam merito admirationem habet.

Neque hæc inclinatio populi sui, belli cupida et pacem ægre tolerans, obfuit, quo minus perpetuis suis temporibus pacem coleret et teneret. Atque hanc ejus voluntatem cum successu conjunctam inter maximas ejus laudes pono. Hoc enim ætati suæ felix, hoc sexui decorum, hoc conscientiæ salutare fuit. Tentata paulisper, circa decimum regni sui annum, in partibus borealibus rerum commotio, sed statim sopita et ex-

[1] *detrimentum.* MS.
[2] *obierit.* R.
[3] *Et etiam.* R.

tincta est. Reliqui anni interna pace, eaque secura atque alta, floruere.

Pacem autem florentissimam judico duabus de causis, quæ ad meritum pacis nihil faciunt, ad gloriam maxime: una, quod vicinorum calamitatibus, veluti flammis lucentibus, magis fiebat conspicua et illustrata; altera, quod commodis pacis armorum honor non defuit; cum celebritatem nominis Anglici in armis et re militari per multa decora non solum retineret, sed etiam augeret. Nam et auxilia in Belgium, Galliam, et Scotiam præbita,[1] et navales expeditiones susceptæ in Indias, atque ex illis nonnullæ per universi globi terrarum ambitum factæ, et classes in Lusitaniam et ad oras Hispaniæ infestandas missæ,[2] et rebelles in Hibernia sæpius concisi et domiti, nihil aut de virtute bellica gentis nostræ remitti, aut de ejusdem fama et honore deperire, sinebant.

Aderat etiam gloriæ meritum, quod et regibus vicinis tempestivis ab ipsa[3] auxiliis regnum conservatum est;[4] et populis supplicibus (pessimo principum consilio) ministrorum suorum crudelitati et plebis furori et omni lanienæ et vastitati relictis et fere devotis, levamentum malorum datum est; per quod res eorum adhuc stetere.

Nec minus consiliis quam auxiliis benefica et salutaris hæc[5] princeps fuit: ut quæ regem Hispaniarum toties de lenienda in subditos suos in Belgio ira, et illis suo imperio sub tolerabili aliqua conditione restituendis, interpellavit: et reges Galliæ perpetuis et repetitis monitis de edictis suis pacem spondentibus observandis maxima fide solicitavit. Neque[6] negaverim consilio

[1] *missa.* R.
[2] *submissæ.* R.
[3] *ab ipsa* om. MS.
[4] *sit.* R.
[5] *hæc* om. R.
[6] *Non.* R.

ejus successum defuisse. Neque enim prius illud sivit fatum Europæ commune; ne forte ambitio Hispaniæ, veluti carceribus liberata, in majus[1] regnorum et rerumpublicarum orbis Christiani detrimentum (ut tunc res erant) se effunderet. Hoc etiam posterius non sivit sanguis tot innocentium cum uxoribus et liberis ad focos et cubilia sua per infimam plebis fæcem, ut belluas quasdam publica auctoritate et animatas et armatas et missas, effusus; qui ut regnum tam nefario scelere obligatum mutuis cædibus et contrucidationibus expiaretur, in ultionem poscebat. Illa tamen utcunque officium fœderatæ et prudentis et benevolæ præstitit.

Alia etiam subest causa, cur pacem ab Elizabetha cultam et conservatam admiremur: ea nimirum, quod non a temporum inclinatione sed ab ejus prudentia et rebus bene ordinatis pax ista profecta est.[2] Nam cum et interna factione ob causam religionis laboraret, et hujus regni robur et præsidium universæ Europæ instar propugnaculi esset adversus regis Hispaniæ illis temporibus formidabilem et exundantem ambitionem et potentiam, belli materia non defuit, verum ipsa et copiis et consiliis superfuit. Id[3] eventus docuit maxime memorabilis inter res gestas nostri seculi universas, si felicitatem spectes. Nam cum classis Hispana,[4] tanto rerum tumore et totius Europæ terrore et expectatione, et tanta victoriæ fiducia, freta nostra secaret,[5] nec naviculam aliquam in mari excepit,[6] nec villulam aliquam incendio vastavit, nec littus omnino attigit: sed prælio fusa, misera fuga et crebris naufragiis dissipata est; atque pax Anglico solo et finibus immota et inconcussa mansit.

[1] *majus* om. R.
[2] *sit.* R.
[3] *Istud.* R.
[4] *Hispanica.* R.
[5] *sulcaret.* R.
[6] *accepit.* R.

Nec minus felix in conjuratorum insidiis devitandis quam in copiis hostilibus devincendis et propulsandis fuit. Non paucæ enim contra vitam ejus conspirationes factæ, felicissime et patefactæ et disturbatæ sunt. Neque ex eo vita ejus magis trepida aut anxia; non stipatorum numerus auctus, non tempus intra palatium actum, et rarus in publicum processus; sed secura et fidens, et potius liberationis a periculo quam periculi ipsius memor, nihil de consuetudine sua pristina vivendi mutavit.

Etiam illud notatu dignum videtur, qualia tempora fuerint in quibus floruit. Sunt enim quædam secula tam barbara et rerum nescia, ut homines, tanquam animalium greges, imperio coërcere nil magnum fuerit. Hæc autem princeps in tempora eruditissima et excultissima incidit; in quibus eminere et excellere, non absque maximis ingenii dotibus et singulari virtutis temperamento datur.[1]

Etiam imperia fœminarum nuptiis fere obscurantur, laudesque et acta in maritos transeunt: illis autem quæ innuptæ degunt, propria et integra gloria manet. In illam vero hoc magis cadit, quod nullis imperii adminiculis, nisi quæ ipsa sibi comparaverat, fulciebatur. Non frater uterinus aderat, non patruus, non alius quispiam e[2] familia et stirpe regia, qui particeps ei[3] curarum et dominationis subsidium esset. Sed et eos quos ipsa ad honores evexerat ita et cohibuit et commiscuit, ut singulis maximam[4] complacendi solicitudinem injiceret, atque ipsa semper sui juris esset.

Orba sane fuit, nec stirpem ex se reliquit; quod etiam felicissimis contigit, Alexandro Magno, Julio

[1] *dabatur.* R.
[2] *e* om. R.
[3] *ei* om. MS.
[4] *maximè.* MS.

Cæsari, Trajano, aliis; et semper varie jactatum, et in contrarias partes trahi et disputari solet; cum alii hoc in diminutionem felicitatis accipiant, ne forte homines supra mortalem conditionem bearentur, si et in individuo et in speciei propagatione felices essent; alii autem in cumulum felicitatis rem vertant, quod ea demum felicitas completa videatur, in quam fortunæ nil amplius liceat; quod, si posteri sint, fieri non potest.

Aderant ei et externa; statura procera, corpus decoræ compagis,[1] summa dignitas oris cum suavitate, valetudo maxime prospera. Superest et illud, quod ad extremum valens et vigens, nec fortunæ commutationes nec senectutis mala experta, eam quam tantopere sibi votis precari solebat Augustus Cæsar *euthanasian* facili et leni obitu sortita sit: quod etiam de Antonino Pio imperatore optimo celebratur, cujus mors somni alicujus suavis et placidi imaginem habebat. Similiter et in Elizabethæ morbo nil miserabile,[2] nil omninosum, nil ab humana natura alienum erat. Non desiderio vitæ, non morbi impatientia, non doloris cruciatibus torquebatur: nullum aderat symptoma dirum aut fœdum; sed omnia ejus generis erant, ut naturæ fragilitatem potius quam corruptionem aut dedecus ostenderent. Paucos enim ante obitum dies, ex corporis nimia siccitate, et curis quæ regni culmen sequuntur attenuati, nec unquam mero aut uberiore diæta irrigati,[3] nervorum rigore perculsa, vocem tamen (quod fieri non solet in ejusmodi morbo) et mentem et motum, licet tardiorem et hebetiorem, retinuit. Atque is personæ suæ[4] status paucis

[1] *corporis decora compages.* R.
[2] *atrox.* R.
[3] *attenuata ... irrigata.* R. which perhaps is the true reading.
[4] *ejus.* R.

diebus tantum duravit; ut non tanquam actus vitæ novissimus, sed tamquam primus gradus ad mortem fuerit. Nam imminutis facultatibus in vita diu manere miserum;[1] sed a sensu paulatim sopito ad mortem properare, placida et clemens vitæ clausula est.

Addo et illud in felicitatis ejus cumulum insignem: quod non tantum nomine proprio, sed et ministrorum[2] virtute, felicissima fuit. Tales enim viros nacta est, quales fortasse hæc insula antehac[3] non peperit. Deus autem, regibus favens, etiam spiritus ministrorum excitat et ornat.

Restant felicitates posthumæ duæ, iis quæ vivam comitabantur fere celsiores et augustiores; una successoris, altera memoriæ. Nam successorem sortita est eum, qui licet et mascula virtute et prole et nova imperii accessione fastigium ejus excedat et obumbret, tamen et nomini et honoribus ejus faveat, et actis ejus quandam perpetuitatem donet: cum nec ex personarum delectu nec ex institutorum ordine quicquam magnopere mutaverit: adeo ut raro filius parenti tanto silentio atque tam exigua mutatione et perturbatione successerit. Memoria autem ejus ita et in ore hominum et in animis viget, ut, per mortem extincta invidia atque accensa[4] fama, felicitas memoriæ cum felicitate vitæ quodammodo certet. Nam si qua ex studio partium et dissensione religionis vagatur fama factiosa (quæ tamen ipsa jam timida videtur, et consensu victa), ea et sincera non est, et perennis esse non potest. Atque ob eam causam præcipue hæc[5] de felicitate ejus et divini favoris notis collegi; ut malev-

[1] *miserum habetur.* R.
[2] *ministrorum status.* R.
[3] *ante eum diem.* R.
[4] *incensa.* R.
[5] *hæc qualia sunt.*

olus aliquis tantis Dei benedictionibus suas maledictiones inserere vereatur.

Si quis autem ad hæc, ut ille ad Cæsarem, "Quæ miremur habemus: sed et quæ[1] laudemus expectamus;" sane existimo veram admirationem quendam laudis excessum esse. Neque ea quam descripsimus felicitas ulli evenire potest, nisi qui et a divina charitate[2] eximie sustineatur atque foveatur, ac etiam moribus et virtute hanc fortunam sibi aliqua ex parte finxerit. Sed tamen visum est pauca admodum quæ ad mores pertinent subjungere,[3] in iis solummodo quæ iniquorum sermonibus maxime aditum et fomitem præbere videntur.

Fuit Elizabetha in religione pia et moderata, et constans ac novitatis inimica. Atque pietatis indicia, licet in factis et rebus quas gessit maxime elucescant, tamen et in vitæ ratione et consuetudine familiari non leviter[4] adumbrata sunt. Liturgiis et divinis officiis, aut sacello solenniore aut interiore, raro abfuit. In Scripturis et patrum scriptis (præcipue beati Augustini) legendis, multum versata est. Preces quasdam ipsa[5] ex occasione et re nata composuit. In Dei mentionem vel communi sermone incidens, fere semper et[6] Creatoris nomen addidit, et oculos et vultum ad humilitatem et reverentiam quandam composuit; quod et ipse sæpe notavi. Quod autem quidam vulgaverunt, eam minime mortalitatis memorem fuisse, adeo ut nec de senectute nec de morte mentionem æquo animo ferret, id falsissimum fuit; cum ipsa sæpissime, multis ante mortem annis, magna comitate se vetulam diceret;

[1] *sed quæ.* R.
[2] *gratia.* R.
[3] *adjungere.* R.
[4] *non leviter* om. R.
[5] *ipsa* om. MS.
[6] *et* om. R.

et de inscriptione sepulchri, quid sibi maxime placeret, sermones haberet; cum diceret sibi gloriam et splendidos titulos minime cordi esse; sed lineam memoriæ unam aut alteram, quæ nomen ejus tantum, et virginitatem, et tempus regni, et religionis instaurationem, et pacis conservationem, brevi verborum compendio significaret. Verum est, cum ætate florenti et liberis procreandis habili de successore declarando interpellaretur, respondisse, Se linteum sepulchrale sibi vivæ ante oculos obtendi nullo modo passuram. Attamen non multis ante mortem annis, cum cogitabunda esset, ac, ut verisimile est, de mortalitate sua meditaretur, et[1] quidam ex intimis sermonem intulisset, quod munera et loca multa et magna in republica nimium diu vacarent, commotior et assurgens, Se certo scire suum locum ne tantillum temporis vacaturum dixit.

Quod ad moderationem in religione attinet, hærere videbimur, propter legum in subditos religionis pontificiæ latarum severitatem. Sed ea proferemus quæ nobis et certo nota et diligenter notata sunt.

Certissimum est, hunc fuisse istius principis animi sensum, ut vim conscientiis adhibere nollet; sed rursus statum regni sui prætextu conscientiæ et religionis in discrimen venire non permitteret. Ex hoc fonte, primum duarum religionum libertatem et tolerationem auctoritate publica, in populo animoso et feroce, et ab animorum contentione ad manus et arma facile veniente,[2] certissimam perniciem judicavit. Etiam in novitate regni, cum omnia suspecta essent, ex præsulibus ecclesiæ quosdam magis turbidi et factiosi ingenii, auctoritate legis accedente, sub custodia libera habuit. Reliquis utriusque ordinis, non acri aliqua inquisitione

[1] *ut.* R. [2] *veniente admittere.* R.

molesta, sed benigna conniventia præsidio fuit. Hic primus rerum status: neque de hac clementia, licet excommunicatione Pii quinti provocata, quæ et indignationem addere et occasionem præbere novi instituti potuit, quidquam fere mutavit, sed natura sua uti perseveravit. Nam prudentissima fœmina et magnanima, hujusmodi terrorum sonitu nil admodum commota est; secura de populi sui fide et amore, et de factionis pontificiæ intra regnum ad nocendum virium tenuitate, non accedente hoste externo. At sub vicesimum tertium regni sui annum, rerum commutatio facta est. Atque hæc temporis distinctio non commode ficta, sed in publicis actis expressa ac veluti in ære incisa est.

Neque enim ante annum eum gravior aliqua pœna per leges prius sancitas subditis suis[1] pontificiæ religionis incubuit. Verum sub hoc tempus, ambitiosum et vastum Hispaniæ consilium de hoc regno subjugando paulatim detegi cœpit. Hujus pars magna fuit, ut omnibus modis intra regni viscera factio a statu aliena et rerum novarum cupida excitaretur, quæ hosti invadenti adhæreret. Ea ex dissensione religionis sperabatur. Itaque huic rei[2] omni opera incumbendum statuebant, et pullulantibus tunc seminariis, sacerdotes in regnum immissi qui studium religionis Romanæ excitarent et spargerent, vim excommunicationis Romanæ in fide solvenda[3] docerent et[4] inculcarent, et animos hominum novarum rerum expectatione erigerent et præpararent. Circa idem tempus, et Hibernia apertis armis tentabatur; et nomen et regimen Elizabethæ variis et sceleratis libellis proscindebatur: denique insolitus erat rerum tumor, prænuntius ma-

[1] *suis* om. R.
[2] *rei* om. R.
[3] *fide subditorum solvenda.* R.
[4] *et* om. MS.

joris motus. Neque sane dixerim singulos sacerdotes in participationem consilii assumptos aut quid ageretur conscios, sed tantummodo prava alienæ malitiæ instrumenta fuisse. Sed tamen hoc verum est et multis confessionibus testatum, omnes fere sacerdotes, qui ab eo quem diximus anno usque ad tricesimum Elizabethæ annum (quo consilium Hispaniæ et pontificium per memorabilem illum et classis et terrestrium copiarum apparatum executioni mandatum erat) in hoc regnum missi[1] erant, habuisse in mandatis inter functionis officia hoc insuper, ut Non posse hæc diutius stare; novam rerum faciem et conversionem non ita multo post conspicuam fore; curæ esse et pontifici et principibus catholicis rem Anglicam, modo ipsi sibi non desint; insinuarent. Etiam ex sacerdotibus nonnulli rebus et machinationibus quæ ad status labefactationem et subversionem pertinebant manifeste se immiscuerant; et, quod maxime movit, consilii hujus et negotii ratio per literas ex multis partibus interceptas[2] patefacta est; in quibus scriptum erat, Vigilantiam reginæ et concilii sui circa catholicos elusam iri. Illam enim ad hoc tantum intentam esse,[3] ne quod caput in persona alicujus nobilis aut viri primarii catholicorum factioni se attolleret. At consilium jam tale adhiberi, ut per homines privatos atque ex inferiore nota, neque eos inter se conspirantes et conscios, per secreta confessionum omnia disponerentur et præpararentur. Atque hæ tum artes adhibebantur, hujusmodi hominibus (quod etiam nuper in casu non dissimili videre licuit) usitatæ et familiares. Hac tanta periculorum tempes-

[1] *immissi.* R.
[2] *per lit. ex m. p. interceptas consilii h. et neg. rat.* R.
[3] *esse* om. R.

tate, lex quædam necessitatis imposita est Elizabethæ, ut eam partem subditorum quæ a se alienata et per hujusmodi venena facta erat quasi insanabilis, atque interim ob vitam privatam a publicis muneribus et expensis immunem ditesceret, gravioribus legum vinculis constringeret. Atque ingravescente malo, cum origo ejus sacerdotibus seminariorum deputaretur, qui in exteris partibus nutriti, et exterorum principum, hujus regni ex professo hostium, opibus et eleemosynis sustentati essent, et in locis versati ubi ne nomen quidem ipsum Elizabethæ, nisi ut hæreticæ, excommunicatæ, diris[1] devotæ, audiebatur; quique (etsi non ipsi criminibus majestatis imbuti) at eorum qui hujusmodi sceleribus operam dedissent intimi cognoscerentur;[2] quique suis artibus et venenis ipsam catholicorum massam, antea magis dulcem et innoxiam, depravassent et novo veluti fermento et perniciosa malignitate infecissent; non aliud inventum est remedium, quam ut hujusmodi homines ab omni in hoc regnum aditu sub pœna capitis prohiberentur: quod tandem vicesimo septimo regni sui anno factum est. Neque ita multo post eventus ipse, cum tanta tempestas hoc regnum adorta esset et totis viribus incubuisset, horum hominum invidiam et odium auxit;[3] ac si omnem charitatem patriæ exuissent quam servituti externæ tradere

[1] *et diris.* R.

[2] *agnoscerentur.* R.

[3] *quidquam lenibat sed potius auxit.* R. I have preferred the reading of the MS. because the sentence as given by Rawley is certainly wrong, a negative being wanted. It seems probable however that the error arose from some interlinear correction, either imperfectly made or carelessly read. Perhaps the words *ita multo post* were intended to be struck out, or introduced with *non* after *cum;* with either of which alterations the sentence as given by Rawley reads to me more naturally than that in the MS.

in votis habuissent.[1] Ac postea sane, licet motus[2] ab Hispania qui hujus severitatis stimulus erat consedisset aut remitteretur; tamen cum et memoria præteriti temporis in animis et sensibus hominum alte infixa maneret, et leges semel factas aut abrogare inconstans aut negligere dissolutum videretur, ipsa rerum vis Elizabetham traxit, ut ad priorem rerum statum qui ante vicesimum tertium regni sui annum erat revertere sibi integrum non esset. Huc accessit quorundam in fisci commodis augendis industria, et ministrorum justitiæ qui non aliam patriæ salutem quam quæ legibus continetur introspicere aut intueri consueverunt, solicitudo; quæ omnia[3] executionem legum urgebant.[4] Ipsa tamen, in naturæ suæ specimen manifestum, ita legum mucronem contudit, ut pauci pro numero sacerdotes capitali supplicio plecterentur. Neque hæc defensionis loco dicta sunt, qua res ista non eget:[5] cum et salus regni in hoc verteretur, et universæ istius severitatis ratio et modus longe infra sanguinaria et inter Christianos vix nominanda, atque ex iis nonnulla[6] potius ab arrogantia atque malitia quam a necessitate profecta, pontificiorum exempla steterit. Sed ejus quod asseruimus memores, Elizabetham[7] in causa religionis moderatam fuisse, et variationem quæ fuit, non in natura sua sed in temporibus existitisse, demonstrasse nos existimamus.

De constantia autem Elizabethæ in religione ac

[1] This clause (*quam . . . habuissent*) is omitted by Rawley.
[2] *metus.* R. Which is perhaps right.
[3] *quidem.* R.
[4] *poscebant et urgebant.* R.
[5] *qua res istæ non egent.* R.
[6] *eaque potius.* R.
[7] *eam.* R.

ejus cultu, maximum argumentum est, quod religionem pontificiam, regno sororis auctoritate publica et multa cura impense stabilitam,[1] et altas jam radices agentem, atque omnium qui in magistratibus et cum potestate erant consensu et studio firmatam; tamen quandoquidem nec verbo Dei, nec primitivæ puritati, nec conscientiæ suæ consentanea esset, maximo animo et paucissimis adjumentis convulsit et abrogavit. Neque id præceps aut acri impetu; sed prudenter et tempestive.[2] Idque tum ex multis aliis[3] rebus, tum ex responso quodam[4] suo per occasionem facto conjicere licet. Nam primis regni diebus, cum in omen et gratulationem novi principatus vincti (ut moris est) solverentur, accessit ad eam, ad sacellum tum pergentem, aulicus quidam, qui ex natura et consuetudine jocandi quandam[5] licentiam sibi assumpserat. Isque, sive ex motu proprio sive a quodam[6] prudentiore immissus, libellum supplicem ei porrexit, et[7] magna frequentia clara voce addidit, Restare adhuc quatuor aut quinque vinctos, idque immerito; illis se libertatem ut reliquis petere. Eos esse quatuor Evangelistas, atque etiam apostolum Paulum, qui diu ignota lingua tanquam carcere conclusi, inter populum conversari non possent. Cui illa prudentissime, Sciscitandum adhuc melius ab ipsis esse, utrum liberari vellent.[8] Atque ita improvisæ quæstioni suspenso responso occurrit, veluti omnia integra sibi servans. Neque tamen timide et per vices hæc instillavit; sed ordine gravi et maturo, habito inter partes colloquio, et peractis regni comitiis,

[1] *et stabilitam.* R.
[2] *tempestive fecit.* R.
[3] *aliis multis.* R.
[4] *quopiam.* MS.
[5] *licentiam quandam.* R.
[6] *quopiam.* MS.
[7] *in magna.* R.
[8] *vellent, necne.* R.

tum demum (idque intra orbem unius anni vertentis) ita omnia quæ ad ecclesiam pertinebant ordinavit et stabilivit, ut ne punctum quidem [1] ab illis ad extremum vitæ diem recedi pateretur. Quin et singulis fere regni comitiis, ne quid in ecclesiæ disciplina aut ritibus innovaretur publice monuit. Atque de religione hactenus.

Quod si quis ex tristibus [2] leviora illa exaggeret, quod coli, ambiri, quin et amoris nomine se celebrari, extolli,[3] sinebat,[4] volebat, eaque ultra sortem ætatis continuabat: hæc tamen, si mollius accipias, admiratione et ipsa carere non possunt; cum talia sint fere, qualia in fabulosis narrationibus inveniantur, de regina quadam in insulis beatis ejusque aula atque institutis, quæ amorum admirationem [5] recipiat, lasciviam prohibeat: sin severius, habent et illa admirationem, eamque vel maximam, quod hujusmodi deliciæ non multum famæ, nil prorsus majestati ejus officerent; nec imperium relaxarent, nec impedimento notabili rebus et negotiis gerendis essent. Hujusmodi enim res se cum publica fortuna commiscere haud raro solent. Verum, ut sermones nostros claudamus: fuit certe ista princeps bona et morata, etiam talis videri voluit: vitia oderat, et se bonis artibus clarescere cupiebat. Sane ad mentionem morum illius,[6] in mentem mihi venit quod dicam. Cum scribi ad legatum suum jussisset de quibusdam mandatis ad Reginam Matrem Valesiorum separatim perferendis; atque qui ab epistolis erat clausulam quandam inseruisset, ut legatus diceret, tanquam ad favorem aucupandum,[7] Esse nimirum ipsas

[1] *quidem* om. MS.
[2] *tristioribus.* R.
[3] *et extolli.* R.
[4] *atque volebat.* R.
[5] *amoris administrationem.* R.
[6] *suorum.* R.
[7] *occupandum.* MS.

duas fæminas principes, a quibus, in usu rerum et imperandi virtute et artibus, non minora quam a summis viris expectarentur; comparationem non tulit, sed deleri jussit; Seque artes longe dissimiles et instituta diversa ad imperandum afferre dixit. Nec a potestate aut longo imperio depravata erat; quin et iis laudibus maxime delectabatur, si quis hujusmodi sermones instituisset, ut eam[1] etiamsi in privata et mediocri fortuna [illegible]um traduxisset, tamen non absque aliqua excellentiæ [illegible]ta apud homines victuram fuisse, apte insinuaret.[2] Adeo nihil a fortuna sua ad virtutis laudem mutuare aut transferre volebat. Verum si in ejus laudes, sive morales sive politicas, ingrederer, aut in communes quasdam virtutum notas et commemorationes incidendum est, quod tam rara principe minus dignum; aut si propriam ipsis lucem et gratiam conciliare velim, in vitæ ejus historiam prolabendum, quod et majus otium et venam uberiorem desiderat. Ego enim hæc paucis, ut potui. Sed revera dicendum est; non alium verum hujus fœminæ laudatorem inveniri posse, quam tempus: quod cum tam diu jam volvitur, nihil simile, in hoc sexu, quoad rerum civilium administrationem peperit.

[1] The first clause of this sentence is omitted by Rawley, and the rest stands thus — *Delectabatur etiam haud parum si quis forte hujusmodi sermonem intulisset, Eam .... fuisse.*

[2] The two last words are omitted by Rawley.

ON THE

FORTUNATE MEMORY OF ELIZABETH

QUEEN OF ENGLAND.

ELIZABETH both in her nature and her fortune was a wonderful person among women, a memorable person among princes. But it is not to monks or closet penmen that we are to look for guidance in such a case; for men of that order, being keen in style, poor in judgment, and partial in feeling, are no faithful witnesses as to the real passages of business. It is for ministers and great officers to judge of these things, and those who have handled the helm of government, and been acquainted with the difficulties and mysteries of state business.

The government of a woman has been a rare thing at all times; felicity in such government a rarer thing still; felicity and long continuance together the rarest thing of all. Yet this Queen reigned forty-four years complete, and did not outlive her felicity. Of this felicity I propose to say something; without wandering into praises; for praise is the tribute of men, felicity the gift of God.

First, then, I set it down as part of her felicity

that she was raised to sovereignty from a private fortune; not so much because of that feeling so deeply seated in man's nature, whereby benefits which come unexpected and unhoped for are always counted the greater blessings; but because Princes who are brought up in the reigning house with assured expectation of succeeding to the throne, are commonly spoiled by the indulgence and licence of their education, and so turn out both less capable and less temperate. And therefore you will find that the best kings are they who have been trained in both schools of fortune; such as Henry the Seventh with us, and Lewis the Twelfth in France; both of whom, of late years and almost at the same time, came to their kingdoms not only from a private but from an adverse and troubled fortune; and both were eminently prosperous; the one excelling in wisdom, the other in justice. Much like was the case of this Queen, whose early times and opening prospects fortune chequered with uncertainty, that afterwards when she was settled in the throne it might prove to the last constant and equable. For Elizabeth at her birth was destined to the succession, then disinherited, afterwards superseded. Her fortune in her brother's reign was more propitious and serene, in her sister's more troubled and doubtful. And yet she did not pass suddenly from the prison to the throne, with a mind embittered and swelling with the sense of misfortune, but was first restored to liberty and comforted with expectation; and so came to her kingdom at last quietly and prosperously, without tumult or competitor. All which I mention to show how Divine Providence, meaning to produce an excellent Queen, passed her by way of preparation

through these several stages of discipline. Nor ought the calamity of her mother to be admitted as an objection to the dignity of her birth: the rather because it is clear that Henry the Eighth had fallen in love with another woman before he fell in anger with Anne, and because he has not escaped the censure of posterity as a man by nature extremely prone both to loves and suspicions, and violent in both even to the shedding of blood. And besides, the criminal charge in which she was involved was in itself, if we consider only the person to whom it related, improbable, and rested upon the slenderest conjectures; as was secretly whispered (as the manner is in such cases) even then, and Anne herself just before her death with a high spirit and in memorable words made protestation. For having procured a messenger whose fidelity and good will she thought she could trust, she sent the King, in the very hour when she was preparing for the scaffold, a message to this effect: "That he kept constant to his course of heaping honours upon her; from a gentlewoman without title he had made her marchioness; he had then raised her to be the partner of his throne and bed; and now at last, because there remained no higher step of earthly honour, he had vouchsafed to crown her innocence with martyrdom." Which words the messenger durst not indeed carry to the King, who was then in the heat of a new love; but fame, the vindicator of truth, transmitted them to posterity.

I account also as no small part of Elizabeth's felicity the period and compass of her administration; not only for its length, but as falling within that portion of her life which was fittest for the control of affairs

the ha ng of the reins of government. She twenty-five years old (the age at which guarship ceases) when she began to reign, and she inued reigning till her seventieth year; so that she never experienced either the disadvantages and subjection to other men's wills incident to a ward, the inconveniences of a lingering and impotent age. Now old age brings with it even to private ns miseries enough; but gs, besides those which are common to ings also decline eatness and inglorious evi the stage. For re is hardly any sovereig eigns till he be- s old and feeble, but s s so e diminution of wer and reputation: of have a very emi- example in Philip th King of Spain, ost powerful prince and the art of gov- ent; who in his last times worn out with age became deeply sensible of th which I say, and therefore wisely submitted to the condition of things; voluntarily sacrificed the territories he had won in France, established peace there, attempted the like in other places, that he might leave a settled estate and all things clear and entire to his successor. Elizabeth's fortune on the contrary was so constant and flourishing, that not only did her declining, but though declining still fresh and vigorous years, bring with them no decline at all in the state of her affairs; but it was granted to her for an assured token of her felicity not to die before the fate of the revolt in Ireland had been decided by a victory; lest her glory might seem to be in any part sullied and incomplete.

Nor must it be forgotten withal among what kind of people she reigned; for had she been called to rule

over Palmyrenes or in an unwarlike and effeminate country like Asia, the wonder would have been less; a womanish people might well enough be governed by a woman; but that in England, a nation particularly fierce and warlike, all things could be swayed and controlled at the beck of a woman, is a matter for the highest admiration.

Observe too that this same humour of her people, ever eager for war and impatient of peace, did not prevent her from cultivating and maintaining peace during the whole time of her reign. And this her desire of peace, together with the success of it, I count among her greatest praises; as a thing happy for her times, becoming to her sex, and salutary for her conscience. Some little disturbance there was in the northern counties about the tenth year of her reign, but it was immediately quieted and extinguished. The rest of her years flourished in internal peace, secure and profound.

And this peace I regard as more especially flourishing from two circumstances that attended it, and which though they have nothing to do with the merit of peace, add much to the glory of it. The one, that the calamities of her neighbours were as fires to make it more conspicuous and illustrious; the other that the benefits of peace were not unaccompanied with honour of war, — the reputation of England for arms and military prowess being by many noble deeds, not only maintained by her, but increased. For the aids sent to the Low Countries, to France, and to Scotland; the naval expeditions to both the Indies, some of which sailed all round the globe; the fleets despatched to Portugal and to harass the coasts

of Spain; the many defeats and overthrows of the rebels in Ireland;—all these had the effect of keeping both the warlike virtues of our nation in full vigour and its fame and honour in full lustre.

Which glory had likewise this merit attached,—that while neighbour kings on the one side owed the preservation of their kingdoms to her timely succours; suppliant peoples on the other, given up by ill-advised princes to the cruelty of their ministers, to the fury of the populace, and to every kind of spoliation and devastation, received relief in their misery; by means of which they stand to this day.

Nor were her counsels less beneficent and salutary than her succours; witness her remonstrances so frequently addressed to the King of Spain that he would moderate his anger against his subjects in the Low Countries, and admit them to return to their allegiance under conditions not intolerable; and her continual warnings and earnest solicitations addressed to the kings of France that they would observe their edicts of pacification. That her counsel was in both cases unsuccessful, I do not deny. The common fate of Europe did not suffer it to succeed in the first; for so the ambition of Spain, being released as it were from prison, would have been free to spend itself (as things then were) upon the ruin of the kingdoms and commonwealths of Christendom. The blood of so many innocent persons, slaughtered with their wives and children at their hearths and in their beds by the vilest rabble, like so many brute beasts animated, armed, and set on by public authority, forbade it in the other; that innocent blood demanding in just revenge that the kingdom which had been guilty of so

atrocious a crime should expiate it by mutual slaughters and massacres. But however that might be, she was not the less true to her own part, in performing the office of an ally both wise and benevolent.

Upon another account also this peace so cultivated and maintained by Elizabeth is matter of admiration; namely, that it proceeded not from any inclination of the times to peace, but from her own prudence and good management. For in a kingdom laboring with intestine faction on account of religion, and standing as a shield and stronghold of defence against the then formidable and overbearing ambition of Spain, matter for war was nowise wanting; it was she who by her forces and her counsels combined kept it under; as was proved by an event the most memorable in respect of felicity of all the actions of our time. For when that Spanish fleet, got up with such travail and ferment, waited upon with the terror and expectation of all Europe, inspired with such confidence of victory, came ploughing into our channels, it never took so much as a cockboat at sea, never fired so much as a cottage on the land, never even touched the shore; but was first beaten in a battle and then dispersed and wasted in a miserable flight with many shipwrecks; while on the ground and territories of England peace remained undisturbed and unshaken.

Nor was she less fortunate in escaping the treacherous attempts of conspirators than in defeating and repelling the forces of the enemy. For not a few conspiracies aimed at her life were in the happiest manner both detected and defeated; and yet was not her life made thereby more alarmed or anxious; there was no increase in the number of her guards; no keeping

palace and seldom going abroad; but still secure and confident, and thinking more of the escape of the danger, she held her wonted course, and no change in her way of life.

hy of remark too is the nature of the times in men she flourished. For there are some times so arous and ignorant that it is as easy a matter to vern men as to drive a flock of sheep. But the lot s Queen fell upon times highly instructed and ated, in which it is not possible to be eminent ellent without the greatest gifts of mind and a ng composition of virtue.

Again, the reigns of women are commonly obscured rriage; their praises and actions passing to the nt of their husbands; whereas those that continue unmarried have their glory entire and proper to themselves. In her case this was more especially so; inasmuch as she had no helps to lean upon in her government, except such as she had herself provided; no own brother, no uncle, no kinsman of the royal family, to share her cares and support her authority. And even those whom she herself raised to honour she so kept in hand and mingled one with another, that while she infused into each the greatest solicitude to please her she was herself ever her own mistress.

Childless she was indeed, and left no issue of her own; a thing which has happened also to the most fortunate persons, as Alexander the Great, Julius Cæsar, Trajan, and others; and which has always been a moot-point and argued on both sides; some taking it for a diminution of felicity, for that to be happy both in the individual self and in the propagation of the kind would be a blessing above the condition of hu-

manity; others regarding it as the crown and consummation of felicity, because that happiness only can be accounted perfect over which fortune has no further power; which cannot be where there is posterity.

Nor were outward conditions wanting: a tall stature, a graceful shape, a countenance in the highest degree majestic and yet sweet, a most happy and healthy constitution; to which this also must be added, that retaining her health and vigour to the end, and having experienced neither the vicissitudes of fortune nor the ills of old age, she obtained at last by an easy and gentle death that *euthanasia* which Augustus Cæsar was wont so earnestly to pray for; and which is noted in the case of that excellent Emperor Antoninus Pius, whose death wore the appearance of a sweet and placid sleep. So likewise in the last illness of Elizabeth there was nothing miserable, nothing terrible, nothing revolting to human nature. She was not tormented either with desire of life, or impatience of sickness, or pangs of pain: none of the symptoms were frightful or loathsome; but all of that kind which showed rather the frailty than the corruption and dishonour of nature. For a few days before her death, by reason of the exceeding dryness of her body, wasted as it was with the cares of government and never refreshed with wine or a more generous diet, she was struck with paralysis; and yet she retained her powers of speech (a thing not usual in that disease) and of mind and of motion; only somewhat slower and duller. And this state of her body lasted only a few days, as if it were less like the last act of life than the first step to death. For to continue long alive with the faculties impaired is a miserable thing; but to have the sense a little laid

asleep and so pass quickly to death, is a placid and merciful period and close of life.

To crown all, as she was most fortunate in all that belonged to herself, so was she in the virtue of her ministers. For she had such men about her as perhaps till that day this island did not produce. But God when he favours kings raises also and accomplishes the spirits of their servants.

Her death was followed by two posthumous felicities, more lofty and august perhaps than those which attended her in life; her successor, and her memory. For successor she has got one who, though in respect of masculine virtue and of issue and of fresh accession of empire he overtop and overshadow her, nevertheless both shows a tender respect for her name and honour, and bestows upon her acts a kind of perpetuity; having made no change of any consequence either in choice of persons or order of proceedings; insomuch that seldom has a son succeeded to a father with such silence and so little change and perturbation. And as for her memory, it is so strong and fresh both in the mouths and minds of men that, now death has extinguished envy and lighted up fame, the felicity of her memory contends in a manner with the felicity of her life. For if any factious rumour (bred of party feeling and religious dissension) still wanders abroad (and yet even this seems now timid and weak and overborne by general consent), sincere it is not, enduring it cannot be. And on this account chiefly it is that I have put together these observations, such as they are, concerning her felicity and the marks she enjoyed of the divine favour, that malevolent men may fear to curse what God has so highly blessed.

And if any man shall say in answer, as was said to Cæsar, "Here is much indeed to admire and wonder at, but what is there to praise?" surely I account true wonder and admiration as a kind of excess of praise. Nor can so happy a fortune as I have described fall to the lot of any, but such as besides being singularly sustained and nourished by the divine favour, are also in some measure by their own virtue the makers of such fortune for themselves. And yet I think good to add some few remarks upon her moral character; confining myself however to those points which seem most to give opening and supply fuel to the speeches of traducers.

In religion Elizabeth was pious and moderate, and constant, and adverse to innovation. Of her piety, though the proofs appear most clearly in her actions, yet no slight traces were to be found likewise in her ordinary way of life and conversation. Prayers and divine service, either in her chapel or closet, she seldom failed to attend. Of the Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers, especially those of St. Augustine, she was a great reader. Some prayers upon particular occasions she herself composed. If she chanced even in common talk to speak of God, she almost always both gave him the title of her Maker, and composed her eyes and countenance to an expression of humility and reverence; a thing which I have myself often observed. And as for that which some have given out, that she could not endure the thought of mortality and was impatient of all allusion either to old age or death, that is utterly untrue. For very often, many years before her death, she would pleasantly call herself an old woman, and would talk of the kind of epitaph she

would l to have upon her tomb; saying that she no fancy for glory or splendid titles, but would her have a line or two of memorial, recording in few words only her name, her virginity, the time of her reign, the reformation of religion, and the preservation peace. It is true that in the flower of her years, she was yet able to bear children, being questioned about declaring a successor, she replied that she ld not have her winding sheet spread before her ile she was alive; and yet not many years be- death, being in a thoughtful mood, meditating adly upon her mortality, and being interrupted by of her familiars with a complaint that many great es in the commonwealth were too long vacant, she up and said in some displeasure, it was clear that *her* office would not be vacant for an instant.

With regard to her moderation in religion there may seem to be a difficulty, on account of the severity of the laws made against popish subjects. But on this point I have some things to advance which I myself carefully observed and know to be true.

Her intention undoubtedly was, on the one hand not to force consciences, but on the other not to let the state, under pretence of conscience and religion, be brought in danger. Upon this ground she concluded at the first that, in a people courageous and warlike and prompt to pass from strife of minds to strife of hands, the free allowance and toleration by public authority of two religions would be certain destruction. Some of the more turbulent and factious bishops also she did, in the newness of her reign when all things were subject to suspicion, — but not without legal warrant — restrain and keep in free custody. The rest,

both clergy and laity, far from troubling them with any severe inquisition, she sheltered by a gracious connivency. This was the condition of affairs at first. Nor even when provoked by the excommunication pronounced against her by Pius Quintus (an act sufficient not only to have roused indignation but to have furnished ground and matter for a new course of proceeding), did she depart almost at all from this clemency, but persevered in the course which was agreeable to her own nature. For being both wise and of a high spirit, she was little moved with the sound of such terrors; knowing she could depend upon the loyalty and love of her own people, and upon the small power the popish party within the realm had to do harm, as long as they were not seconded by a foreign enemy. About the twenty-third year of her reign however, the case was changed. And this distinction of time is not artificially devised to make things fit, but expressed and engraved in public acts.

For up to that year there was no penalty of a grievous kind imposed by previous laws upon popish subjects. But just then the ambitious and vast design of Spain for the subjugation of the kingdom came gradually to light. Of this a principal part was the raising up within the bowels of the realm of a disaffected and revolutionary party which should join with the invading enemy; and the hope of effecting this lay in our religious dissensions. To this object therefore they addressed themselves with all their might; and, the seminaries beginning then to blossom, priests were sent over into England for the purpose of kindling and spreading a zeal for the Romish religion, of teaching and inculcating the power of Romish excommunication

to release subjects from their obedience, and of exciting and preparing men's minds with expectation of a change. About the same time an attempt was made upon Ireland with open arms, the name and government of Elizabeth was assailed with a variety of wicked libels, and there was a strange ferment and swelling in the world, forerunner of some greater disturbance. And though I do not say that all the priests were acquainted with the design, or knew what was doing; for they may have been only the tools of other men's malice; yet it is true, and proved by the confessions of many witnesses, that from the year I have mentioned to the thirtieth of Elizabeth (when the design of Spain and the Pope was put in execution by that memorable armada of land and sea forces) almost all the priests who were sent over to this country were charged among the other offices belonging to their function, to insinuate that matters could not long stay as they were, that a new aspect and turn of things would be seen shortly, and that the state of England was cared for both by the Pope and the Catholic princes, if the English would but be true to themselves. Besides which, some of the priests had plainly engaged themselves in practices tending directly to the shaking and subversion of the state; and above all, letters were intercepted from various quarters by which the plan upon which they were to proceed was discovered; in which letters it was written, that the vigilance of the Queen and her council in the matter of the Catholics would be eluded; for that she was only intent upon preventing the Catholic party from getting a head in the person of any nobleman or great personage, whereas the plan now was to dispose and prepare everything by the

agency of private persons and men of small mark; and that too without their having any communication or acquaintance one with another; but all to be done under the seal of confession. Such were the arts then resorted to — arts with which these men (as we have seen lately in a case not much unlike) are practised and familiar. This so great tempest of dangers made it a kind of necessity for Elizabeth to put some severer constraint upon that party of her subjects which was estranged from her and by these means poisoned beyond recovery, and was at the same time growing rich by reason of their immunity from public offices and burdens. And as the mischief increased, the origin of it being traced to the seminary priests, who were bred in foreign parts, and supported by the purses and charities of foreign princes, professed enemies of this kingdom, and whose time had been passed in places where the very name of Elizabeth was never heard except as that of a heretic excommunicated and accursed, and who (if not themselves stained with treason) were the acknowledged intimates of those that were directly engaged in such crimes, and had by their own arts and poisons depraved and soured with a new leaven of malignity the whole lump of Catholics, which had before been more sweet and harmless; there was no remedy for it but that men of this class should be prohibited upon pain of death from coming into the kingdom at all; which at last, in the twenty-seventh year of her reign, was done. Nor did the event itself which followed not long after, when so great a tempest assailed and fell with all its fury upon the kingdom, tend in any degree to mitigate the envy and hatred of these men; but rather increased it, as if they had utterly

cast off all feeling for their country, which they were ready to betray to a foreign servitude. And though it is true that the fear of danger from Spain, which was the spur that goaded her to this severity, did afterwards subside or abate; yet because the memory of the time past remained deeply printed in men's minds and feelings, and the laws once made could not be abrogated without the appearance of inconstancy, or neglected without the appearance of weakness and disorder, the very force of circumstances made it impossible for Elizabeth to return to the former state of things as it was before the twenty-seventh year of her reign. To which must be added the industry of some of her officers to improve the exchequer, and the solicitude of her ministers of justice who saw no hope of salvation for the country but in the laws; all which demanded and pressed the execution of them. And yet what her own natural disposition was appears plainly in this, that she so blunted the law's edge that but a small proportion of the priests were capitally punished. All which I say not by way of apology; for these proceedings need no apology; since the safety of the kingdom turned upon them, and all this severity both in the manner and the measure of it came far short of the bloody examples set by the priesthood, — examples scarcely to be named among Christians, and proceeding moreover some of them rather out of arrogance and malice than out of necessity. But I conceive that I have made good my assertion, and shown that in the cause of religion she was indeed moderate, and that what variation there was was not in her nature but in the times.

Of her constancy in religion and worship the best

proof is her dealing with Popery: which though in her sister's reign it had been established by public authority and fostered with great care and labour, and had taken deep root in the land, and was strengthened by the consent and zeal of all who were in authority and power; yet because it was not agreeable either to the word of God or to primitive purity or to her own conscience, she at once with the greatest courage and the fewest helps proceeded to uproot and abolish. And yet she did it not precipitately or upon eager impulse, but prudently and all in due season; as may be gathered from many circumstances, and among the rest from a reply made by her on the following occasion. Not many days after she came to the throne, when prisoners were released (as the custom is to inaugurate and welcome a new reign by the release of prisoners), a certain courtier, who from nature and habit had taken to himself the license of a jester, came to her as she went to chapel, and either of his own motion or set on by wiser men, presented her a petition; adding with a loud voice before all the company, that there were yet four or five prisoners more who deserved liberty, for whom he besought that they might be released likewise; namely, the four Evangelists and the Apostle Paul; who had been long shut up in an unknown tongue, as it were in prison, so that they could not converse with the people. To whom she answered very wisely, that it were good first to inquire further of themselves, whether they would be released or no: thus meeting a sudden question with a doubtful answer, as meaning to keep all clear and whole for her own decision. And yet she did not introduce these changes timidly neither, nor by starts; but proceeding

in due order, gravely and maturely, after conference had been first had between the parties, and a Parliament held, she then at last, and yet all within a single year, so ordered and established everything relating to the Church, that to the last day of her life she never allowed a single point to be departed from. Nay, at almost every meeting of Parliament she gave a public warning against innovation in the discipline and rites of the Church. And so much for the point of religion.

As for those lighter points of character, — as that she allowed herself to be wooed and courted, and even to have love made to her; and liked it; and continued it beyond the natural age for such vanities; — if any of the sadder sort of persons be disposed to make a great matter of this, it may be observed that there is something to admire in these very things, which ever way you take them. For if viewed indulgently, they are much like the accounts we find in romances, of the Queen in the blessed islands, and her court and institutions, who allows of amorous admiration but prohibits desire.[1] But if you take them seriously, they challenge admiration of another kind and of a very high order; for certain it is that these dalliances detracted but little from her fame and nothing at all from her majesty, and neither weakened her power nor sensibly hindered her business: — whereas such things are not unfrequently allowed to interfere with the public fortune. But to conclude, she was no doubt a good and moral Queen; and such too she wished to appear. Vices she hated, and it was by honest arts that she desired to shine. And speaking of her morality, I remember a circumstance in point. Having ordered

[1] I have not been able to learn what romance Bacon alludes to here.

a letter to be written to her ambassador concerning a message which was to be given separately to the Queen Mother of the Valois, and finding that her secretary had inserted a clause directing the ambassador to say to the Queen Mother by way of compliment, that they were two Queens from whom though women no less was expected in administration of affairs and in the virtue and arts of government than from the greatest men, — she would not endure the comparison, but ordered it to be struck out; saying that the arts and principles which she employed in governing were of a far other sort than those of the Queen Mother. Nor was she spoiled by power and long reigning: but the praises which pleased her most were when one so managed the conversation as aptly to insinuate that even if she had passed her life in a private and mean fortune she could not have lived without some note of excellency among men; so little was she disposed to borrow anything of her fortune to the credit of her virtue. But if I should enter into her praises, whether moral or political, I should either fall into certain common-place observations and commemorations of virtues, which would be unworthy of so rare a princess; or in order to give them a lustre and beauty peculiar and appropriate, I should have to run into the history of her life, — a task requiring both more leisure and a richer vein. Thus much I have said in few words, according to my ability. But the truth is that the only true commender of this lady is time, which, so long a course as it has run, has produced nothing in this sex like her, for the administration of civil affairs.

END OF VOL. XI.

NOTE.

THE following list of errata, and also others which have been corrected in their proper places, were furnished to the American Publishers by Mr. SPEDDING, one of the Editors of the English edition of Bacon's Works, of which this is a reprint: —

Page 52, *line* 3 *from bottom*, upon the words "obtained the victory upon a Saturday," insert the following note: "So Speed, translating Bernard André. The Battle of Bosworth, however, was really fought on a Monday."

Page 53, *line* 9 *from top*, upon the words "close chariot," insert the following note: "This statement comes from Speed, who so interpreted Bernard André's expression '*latenter* ingressus est.' It appears, however, that the true reading is *lætanter*. See *Memorials of Henry VII.* (London, 1858.) Editor's Preface, p. xxvi."

Page 293, *last line*, for "on the 3rd of October, 1492, (see *Conquerors of the New World and their Bondsmen*, vol. i. p. 100)," read, "on the 11th of October, 1492 (see Helps's *Spanish Conquest in America*, vol. i. 109.)"